

<b>TRANSMITTAL SLIP</b>		DATE
		3/17/71
TO: <i>Legislative Counsel</i>		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	
7D43	Hq.	
REMARKS:		
<p><i>Quack. 8</i></p> <p><i>Thought this might be of use to you on the bill.</i></p> <p><i>Am</i></p>		
FROM:		
<i>ADDP</i>		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	EXTENSION
3C34	Hq.	

**PUBLIC FINANCING OF RADIO FREE  
EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY**

**LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL  
FILE COPY**

**HEARING  
BEFORE THE  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS  
UNITED STATES SENATE  
NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS**

**FIRST SESSION**

**ON**

**S. 18**

**TO AMEND THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND  
EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948 TO PROVIDE  
ASSISTANCE TO RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO FREE  
LIBERTY**

**AND**

**S. 1936**

**TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN AMERI-  
CAN COUNCIL FOR PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNI-  
CATIONS, INCORPORATED, TO GRANT SUPPORT TO THE  
ACTIVITIES OF PRIVATE AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONS  
ENGAGED IN THE FIELD OF COMMUNICATION WITH  
FOREIGN PEOPLES**

**MAY 24, 1971**



**Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations**

**U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE**

**WASHINGTON : 1971**

**64-995**

**LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL  
FILE COPY**

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE  
THE COPY

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas, *Chairman*

JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama	GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont
MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana	KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota
FRANK CHURCH, Idaho	CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey
STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri	JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Kentucky
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island	JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
GALE W. MCGEE, Wyoming	HUGH SCOTT, Pennsylvania
EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Maine	JAMES B. PEARSON, Kansas
WILLIAM B. SPONG, Jr., Virginia	

CARL MARCY, *Chief of Staff*  
ARTHUR M. KUHL, *Chief Clerk*

(II)

## CONTENTS

Statements by:	Page
Bartlett, Paul, former president of Radio New York World Wide, Inc., New York	115
Hillenbrand, Martin J., Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs	23
Reid, Hon. Ogden R., a Representative in Congress from the 26th Congressional District of the State of New York	6
Insertions for the record:	1
Text of S. 18	2
Text of S. 1936	5
Statement of Senator Clifford P. Case at U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, May 24, 1971	12
Letter to Senator J. W. Fulbright, enclosing daily guidance summaries, from Congressman Ogden R. Reid, April 16, 1971	32
Department of State views on the expenditure of \$40 million sought for American Council for International Communications, Inc.	42
"RFE Alters Sullied Image," article by John M. Goshko, the Washington Post, November 22, 1970	47
"Radio Moscow Hit by VOA 'Jamming'," article by Marilyn Berger, the Washington Post, November 16, 1971	48
VOA 173 KC transmitter	52
Letter to Hon. Martin J. Hillenbrand, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, from William P. Durkee, Free Europe, Inc., New York, N.Y., May 28, 1971, enclosing documents concerning RFE treatment of events in Poland prior to December 14, 1970, and the period following through March 1971	66
"Embattled Radio Free Europe Defends Role," article by David Binder, the New York Times, March 15, 1971	71
Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty: History	74
Organizations qualified to receive grants from the American Council for International Communications, Inc.	76
Letter to Senator J. W. Fulbright from You Chan Yang, Ambassador at Large, Republic of Korea, chairman of the board, Radio Free Asia, December 8, 1969, and enclosures	80
Letter to Mr. and Mrs. Pat Holt from L. William Horning, chairman, Radio of Free Asia, Washington, D.C., March 5, 1971, and enclosures	84
Letter to Miss Morella R. Hansen from former U.S. Senator George Murphy, and enclosures	89
Information on Radio Free Asia	126
Memorandum, Subject: Proposed changes in U.S. Government funded broadcasting, by Paul Bartlett, July 1970	127
"American-Soviet 'Broadcasting War,' or How's Your East-West Propaganda?" article by Paul Bartlett, Variety, New York, January 6, 1971	131
Appendix:	140
U.S. Government Radio Facilities in Europe	149
Statement by Free Europe, Inc., submitted by William P. Durkee, president	171
Statement, appendix and annexes by the Radio Liberty Committee, Inc., submitted by Howland H. Sargeant, president	172
Letter to Senator J. W. Fulbright from Frederick C. Barghoorn, professor of political science, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., June 3, 1971	174
Letter to Senator J. W. Fulbright from Foy D. Kohler, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.	174
Letter to Senator J. W. Fulbright and enclosed statement from William E. Griffith, professor of political science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., May 20, 1971	174

## PUBLIC FINANCING OF RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

MONDAY, MAY 24, 1971

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 a.m., in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, Senator J. W. Fulbright (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Fulbright, Sparkman, Spong, Aiken, and Case.  
The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

### OPENING STATEMENT

This morning the Committee on Foreign Relations is meeting to receive testimony on legislative proposals which are designed to authorize public funds for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. These proposals will be inserted at an appropriate place in the record.

(S. 18 follows:)

[S. 18, 92d Cong., first sess.]

A BILL TO amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 is amended by inserting after section 702 the following new section:*

### "AUTHORIZATION FOR GRANTS TO RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

"SEC. 703. There are authorized to be appropriated to the department \$30,000,000 for fiscal year 1972 to provide grants, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate, to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Except for funds appropriated under this section, no funds appropriated after the date of enactment of this section for any fiscal year, under this or any other provision of law, may be made available to or for the use of Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty."

### SCHEDULE OF WITNESSES

The CHAIRMAN. On January 25 of this year, Senator Case, the senior Senator from New Jersey, and a distinguished member of this committee, introduced legislation which drew attention to the need for congressional oversight of the funding of these two radio stations. I understand that, following extensive consultations with the executive branch, Senator Case plans today to introduce another proposal on this subject which has the administration's endorsement.

(S. 1936 follows:)

(1)

[S. 1936, 92d Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To provide for the establishment of an American Council for Private International Communications, Incorporated, to grant support to the activities of private American organizations engaged in the field of communication with foreign peoples

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "American Council for Private International Communications, Incorporated Act of 1971."*

#### CONGRESSIONAL DECLARATION OF UNITY

##### SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(a) that the existence of open communication among the peoples of the world is a matter of continuing concern to the American people and a positive contribution to international stability;

(b) that a free flow of information and ideas will encourage other peoples to enhance their social, political, and material well-being and will increase their awareness of the heritage they share with other peoples including the American people;

(c) that established private organizations in the communications field have demonstrated their effectiveness in furthering the foregoing objectives; and

(d) that in the interest of implementing the above objectives, it is desirable to establish an American Council for Private International Communications, Incorporated, which, by assistance to American private organizations, will enable the private sector of American life to participate in and contribute its skills to a constructive dialog with peoples of other lands.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF A CORPORATION

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized in the District of Columbia a nonmembership, nonprofit corporation to be known as the American Council for Private International Communications, Incorporated (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government. Members of the board, officers, and employees of the corporation shall not be deemed to be employees of the United States Government. To the extent consistent with the provisions of this Act, the corporation shall be subject to the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

#### ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

SEC. 3. (a) **STRUCTURE OF THE CORPORATION.**—The corporation shall have a board of directors, a president, and such other officer and staff as the board of directors may determine. The corporation shall maintain its principal office in the District of Columbia and shall, at all times, maintain therein a designated agent to accept service of process for the corporation. Notice to or service upon the agent shall be deemed notice of service upon the corporation.

(b) **BOARD OF DIRECTORS.**—(1) The corporation shall have a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the "board"), consisting of eleven members, including a chairman and a vice chairman, all of whom shall be appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than six members of the board shall be members of the same political party. The President shall designate one of the members first appointed to the board as chairman. After the expiration of his term or conclusion of his service as chairman prior thereto, the members of the board shall annually elect one of their members as chairman. The members of the board shall also annually elect one of their members as vice chairman.

(2) **SELECTION.**—All members of the board shall be citizens of the United States who are not regular full-time employees of the United States Government, and shall be selected from areas of professional, business, and cultural life relevant to the objectives of the corporation.

(3) **INCORPORATION.**—The members of the initial board shall serve as incorporators and shall take whatever actions are necessary to establish the corporation under this District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

(4) **TERM OF OFFICE.**—In appointing the initial membership of the board the President shall designate six members, including the chairman, to serve from the date of incorporation for four years and five members to serve from the date of

incorporation for four years and five members to serve from the date of incorporation for two years. Thereafter the term of office of each member of the board, including the chairman, shall be four years, renewable at the discretion of the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph: (A) the President of the United States shall appoint members to fill vacancies occurring prior to the expiration of a term, in which case the member so appointed shall serve for the remainder of such term; (B) any member whose term has expired may serve until his successor has qualified.

(5) COMPENSATION.—Members of the board shall while attending meetings of the board or while engaged in duties related to such meetings or in other activities of the board pursuant to this section, including traveltime, be entitled to receive compensation equal to the daily equivalent of the compensation at the rate prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code. While away from their homes or regular place of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, equal to that authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(c) OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.—(1) The board shall appoint the president of the corporation and such other officers as may be necessary. All officers shall be citizens of the United States and shall serve at the pleasure of the board. No political test or qualification shall be used by the board in selecting, appointing, promoting, or taking other personnel actions with respect to officers, agents, and employees of the corporation.

(2) COMPENSATION.—The president of the corporation shall receive compensation at a rate not exceeding that prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code. Other officers appointed by the board or employees appointed by the president of the corporation shall receive compensation at rates as set by the board but such rates shall not exceed the maximum rate prescribed for GS-18 in the General Schedule of section 5332(a) of title 5, United States Code.

#### NONPROFIT NATURE OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 4. (a) The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, or to declare or pay any dividends.

(b) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to the benefit of any director, officer, employee, or any other individual except as salary or reasonable compensation for services.

(c) The corporation may not contribute to or otherwise support any political party or candidate for elective public office. The corporation, including its property and income, shall be exempt from taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States or any territory or possession thereof.

#### POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 5. In addition to the powers conferred upon the corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, the corporation is authorized to—

(a) contract with, or render financial assistance, including grants, under such terms and conditions as the board may approve to those private American organizations with established programs of broadcasting to other countries, or with other selected activities in the international mass media field, which organizations receive no other appropriated funds of the United States Government and which demonstrate their effectiveness in promoting the free movement of information and ideas across national frontiers, thereby strengthening channels of communications among the peoples of the world.

(b) to develop and apply procedures, including audits, as may be necessary to insure that funds so granted are applied in accordance with the purposes for which each such grant is made.

(c) to give particular encouragement and assistance to those American private organizations which—

(1) are in turn qualified to enlist financial and other support from American private organizations, industry, and individuals;

(2) enjoy or are capable of enlisting cooperation or financial support from international or foreign organizations which share these objectives;

(d) to prescribe such regulations as it deems necessary governing the manner in which its functions shall be carried out;

(e) to make and perform contracts when deemed necessary to carry out its objectives;

(f) to receive money and other property donated, bequeathed, or devised, without condition or restriction other than it be used for the purposes of the corporation, and to use, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property for the carrying out of its functions. (For the purposes of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as amended (26 U.S.C. 170), the corporation shall be deemed to be a corporation described in section 170(c)(2) thereof.)

(g) to obtain from time to time as appropriate, the services of experts and consultants to aid the corporation in accordance with the carrying out of the purposes of this Act;

(h) to accept and utilize on behalf of the corporation the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel from private life and to reimburse them for travel expenses, including per diem, as appropriate;

(i) to rent office in the District of Columbia and elsewhere as necessary to its purposes;

(j) to make all other expenditures as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

#### ANNUAL REPORT

Sec. 6. The corporation shall on or before the 30th day of September of each year submit an annual report, with financial appendices as appropriate, on its activities under this Act during the year ending the preceding June 30 to the President of the United States and to the Congress. Such report shall include a list of the grants made by the corporation during the preceding year and a statement of the use to which such grants were put.

#### AUDIT

Sec. 7. (a) The accounts of the corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants licensed on or before December 31, 1970; who are certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States; except that an independent public accountant licensed to practice by such regulatory authority after December 31, 1970, may perform such audits until December 31, 1975.

(b) In addition to the annual audit, the financial transactions of the corporation for any fiscal year during which Federal funds are available to finance any portion of its operations may be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. Any such audit shall be conducted at the place or places where accounts of the corporation are normally kept. The representative of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation pertaining to its financial transactions and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents and custodians. All such books, accounts, records, reports, files, paper, and property of the corporation shall remain in the possession and custody of the corporation. A report of any such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress and to the President, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as he shall deem advisable.

#### FINANCING

Sec. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the activities of the corporation, which sums shall remain available until expended. Except for funds appropriated pursuant to this Act, no funds appropriated after the date of the first appropriation pursuant to this Act may be made available to or for the use of the corporation.

Our witnesses this morning include the Honorable Ogden Reid, sponsor of this legislation in the House of Representatives; Martin J.

Hillenbrand, the Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs; and Mr. Paul Bartlett, former president, Radio New York World Wide, Inc. Mr. Bartlett requested to testify on the proposals under consideration this morning.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR CASE AND CONGRESSMAN REID

Before calling the first witness, I want to say that Senator Case and Congressman Reid are to be congratulated for their efforts to subject the funding of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to the normal authorization and appropriation processes of the Congress. Only in this way can the expenditure of public moneys be scrutinized and evaluated as required by our Constitution.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CASE

Senator Case has a prepared statement and has asked that it be inserted at this point in the record.

(The information referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE AT FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE  
HEARING ON RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY, MAY 24, 1971

I am extremely pleased that the Administration has accepted my proposal to remove Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty from CIA funding.

The Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate as a whole will now be considering ways to provide open appropriations to these two stations. This is only proper, for the Constitution clearly states that Congress has the sole authority to appropriate Government funds.

During the last 20 years, several hundred million dollars of U.S. Government funds have been expended from secret CIA budgets to pay almost totally for these two radio stations' broadcasting to Eastern Europe; yet at no time was Congress asked to or permitted to carry out its traditional Constitutional role of approving the expenditure.

I can understand why covert funds might have been used for a year or two in an emergency situation when extreme secrecy was necessary and when no other Government funds were available. But the justification has lessened over the years as international tension has eased, as the secrecy surrounding these radio stations has melted away, and as more open means of funding could have been developed. In other words, the extraordinary circumstances that might have once been thought to justify circumvention of Constitutional processes and Congressional approval no longer exist.

Thus, on January 25 of this year I introduced a bill which would have provided for direct Congressional appropriations to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. But I was by no means wedded to this particular solution. In subsequent conversations with Administration officials I made clear that my purpose was to find any suitable mechanism which would bring the stations out from under CIA. To this end, I sent a draft bill to the State Department in March which would have set up a public corporation to run the two stations.

The Administration now has responded with its own proposal for open funding of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty through a non-profit corporation to be known as the American Council for Private International Communications, Incorporated. Later today I shall introduce the Administration bill in the Senate. While I approve of the basic premise in this bill, there are several specific provisions to which the Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate will have to give the closest scrutiny.

Assistant Secretary Hillenbrand is here representing the Administration, and he will surely provide the details of the legislation.

I will only say that, among other things, we in the Senate should give careful consideration to whether it is appropriate for the President to appoint all the Council's directors as the Administration has suggested. Additionally, the Administration bill provides for an open-ended Congressional authorization of funds

which would necessitate only annual appropriations. I would be inclined to favor specific authorizations which would have to be renewed on an annual basis.

We shall need firm assurances that CIA participation in the stations will be terminated. I understand that the Administration does not feel it can discuss this question in open session, but I know we shall deal with it privately.

And, of course, we shall have to establish that money appropriated for the American Council for Private International Communications, Inc. is not to be made available to any organization except Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The Council should not be used as a means of expanding Government participation in the dissemination of information overseas.

Nowhere in the Administration bill is Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty mentioned, but I want the record to show that it is only for support of these two stations that the American Council for Private International Communications is being established. If the Administration at some future date should wish to expand the Council's activities, I would expect the Administration to return to Congress for authorization.

In closing, I would like to congratulate the Administration for its position on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. We in Congress can be encouraged that the Administration has reacted to our initiative.

Congressman Reid, do you have a prepared statement?

**STATEMENT OF HON. OGDEN R. REID, A REPRESENTATIVE IN  
CONGRESS FROM THE 26TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE  
STATE OF NEW YORK**

Mr. REID. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you proceed, please, sir.

Mr. REID. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I very much appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to testify on the nature of the funding of two American radio stations operating overseas: Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, the former which broadcasts to five Eastern European countries (Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary), and the latter which broadcasts to the Soviet Union.

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS EARLY IN SESSION**

As members of the committee know, in the early days of this Congress, Senator Case introduced on the Senate side, and I introduced on the House side, bills which would amend the U.S. Informational and Educational Exchange Act to authorize \$30 million annually in grants to Radio Free Europe (RFE) and Radio Liberty (RL). This action was taken on the basis of evidence that our offices had that approximately this amount of Federal funds was being appropriated to RFE and RL from secret budgets—via the Central Intelligence Agency. Our bills would provide approximately the same amount of funds to these stations, but through open congressional funding, consistent with our constitutional role of approving such expenditures.

**ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS**

Since that time, both Senator Case and I have been in close communication with the Department of State, the CIA, and other Government officials who have indicated an interest in this legislation. Now it is my understanding that the State Department, the 40 Committee headed by Dr. Henry Kissinger, and the President have

approved the legislation that Senator Case and I plan to introduce today. Needless to say, we welcome the administration's change of view on this matter.

#### ENHANCEMENT OF RFE AND RL CREDIBILITY

After a short discussion on the concept of these two stations, I will turn to a consideration of the administration's proposals, the broad outline of which I support, with some specific exceptions. Basically, however, I am here today to support this bill, and to enhance thereby, we hope, the credibility of RFE and RL, which I consider to be useful and informational broadcasters whose major desire is to get international, national, and local news to persons who otherwise have no access or limited access to these events. In my judgment, this is not only a question of open funding, but equally of the independence of the stations themselves.

To illustrate this, as a former editor of the Paris edition of the Herald Tribune, I became slightly familiar with some of the problems of the private American press working overseas. By far the most important consideration in the workings of the paper—and I cannot emphasize this enough—was its credibility in France and throughout Western Europe.

I remember, for instance, during the early days of the Korea war, one of our correspondents in Korea, Homer Bigart, wrote several stories which were very critical of our military performance in Korea. Basically, he reported that our troops were running like rabbits; they were suffering high casualties and, in sum, were performing ineffectively. The story was teletyped back to Paris, and the U.S. Embassy in Paris then made strong representations to the paper not to run further reporting of this character, as it put the United States in a bad light. Obviously, we continued to run Homer Bigart's first-rate reporting.

In France, there was considerable surprise that the Americans were admitting that things were going badly. Later, as we know, the military situation changed; Homer Bigart sent home stories which documented the change. And they were, I believe, credited all over France with accuracy. There was credibility, because what was in those stories was the truth, and in the end, people know what the truth is. In the end, lies catch up with their authors.

So I think that credibility, in the long run, has to be our most important consideration.

Consistent with this, one of the most important reasons the Tribune was credible was that it was edited in Europe, not 3,000 miles away in New York.

#### POSSIBLE INFLUENCE FROM WASHINGTON

We have looked into RFE's and RL's procedures in this regard. Although stories are, of course, written and edited in Munich, there is also the possibility of a definite influence on these operations which stems from Washington. I would oppose the continuation of explicit or mandatory instructions coming from the CIA or elsewhere under this new system, as I strongly believe that the stations should be inde-

pendent. While this may not be the time to go into past mechanics in this regard, suffice it to say that editorializing in the commentaries is not unknown on these stations and at times has been pronounced. This only relates, of course, to commentary or politically oriented programs; but since these make up a plurality of RFE programing (34.7 percent, as opposed to 16.1 percent news, 21.6 percent music and entertainment, and 27.6 percent miscellaneous), it would be, in my judgment, an important factor.

#### ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL ESTABLISHING PUBLIC-PRIVATE CORPORATION

In order to conform to what Senator Case and I felt a strong need for open funding, the administration has submitted a proposal which would establish basically a public-private corporation. This legislation would not create any agency or department of the Government; it would be line-itemed in the budget under "Independent Agencies," however, and funded accordingly. A similar precedent was set in the establishment of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The advantages of such a corporation should be independence and freedom to broadcast what it wishes. The private media are better at this than the Government. The free press brings a fresh point of view and has the opportunity to reflect adversary positions. Content, therefore, would not be solely determined by administration policy, and would reflect outside points of view. In the long run, it is more credible, in great part due to its independence.

The concept of this legislation should, I believe, be broad, but should aim specifically at free and open expression. It should enable operations to be directed essentially from Europe; and guidance, in my judgment, should be limited to background material and informational aid, not editorial opinion, and not mandatory instructions from the CIA.

The administration's proposal which, as I have said, Senator Case and I plan to introduce today, calls for an 11-member Board of Directors, all of whom would be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to be selected "from areas of professional, business, and cultural life relevant to the objectives of the Corporation."

#### SUGGESTED ALTERATIONS IN ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL

As precedent, I have noted that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's Board would consist of 15 members appointed by the President, but in addition more specifically provides that members are to be eminent in education, cultural, civic, or communicational affairs, and are to "as nearly as practicable" represent various regions of the country, various professions, and various talents and experience.

In my view, the proposal on the character of this new Board should be altered to be at the very least as specific as was the legislation for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. At best, I would urge that it should be amended to include some appointees by the Congress (presumably by the Speaker of the House and the President pro tem of the Senate), by the President from nominees selected by the National Association of Broadcasters, by the Secretary of the Smithsonian, and

by the president of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Such a structure of the Board would emphasize communications and media above political relationships, and would therefore greatly enhance the credibility of the broadcasting.

Apart from the structure of the Board and the corporation specifically, I would like to see language in the bill which was broad enough to create an umbrella structure—not unlike the British Council. This then could become a genuine public-private corporation, with both public and private entities added to it, concerned with the exchange of ideas, culture, and the arts throughout the world. Although I would support the view of starting out this corporation with only the inclusion of RFE and RL, I think we should keep the language of the charter broad enough to allow it to become, if the need arises, and I believe it would, a broad public-private structure.

#### PURPOSE OF EFFORTS TO CHANGE FUNDING PROCEDURES

In closing, may I emphasize again that our efforts over the past several months to change the funding procedures of RFE and RL have been made strictly for the purposes of enhancing the independence and credibility of those two stations and of the congressional procedures that are clearly constitutional. I applauded Senator Case's efforts in this regard, I welcome the administration's acceptance of our general proposal, and I urge the committee, most respectfully, to consider this issue and this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Sparkman.

Senator SPARKMAN. I pass for the time being, Mr. Chairman. I was late getting in.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Aiken.

#### TYPE OF BROADCASTING BY RADIO LIBERTY

Senator AIKEN. Radio Liberty broadcasts only to Russia. What type of broadcasting would that be? Is it a type intended to make the Russian people discontented with their Government?

Mr. REID. That relates a bit to the guidances that Radio Liberty receives, some of which I have here, as well as to the daily reporting of the news and the commentary.

I think that there have been efforts to report incidents which would influence certain trends in the Soviet Union. I would hope that it would not be in the area you suggest because I think that would be counter-productive.

I have not examined all of the material that they have broadcast in Radio Liberty. I have spot checked some of it.

#### FUTURE OPERATION OF RADIO LIBERTY

Senator AIKEN. In the future, who would operate Radio Liberty—a private organization?

Mr. REID. In the future it would be under this private corporation and under the Board of Directors.

Senator AIKEN. Who is on the Board?

Mr. REID. It would be an 11-man Board appointed in the administration bill by the President; but the committee, in its wisdom, might want to provide for some appointees not appointed by the President, who would reflect some of the concerns you mentioned, and with broad experience in the media.

CONTENT OF U.S.S.R. BROADCASTING

Senator AIKEN. Does the U.S.S.R., which broadcasts wholly on Government-owned radio, broadcast similar programs to Western Europe or to other anti-Communist countries?

Mr. REID. They certainly have substantial broadcasting. I have not compared the content, and I would not be in position to say whether they are similar, but I think one of the questions that needs to be raised here, aside from the independence of these stations, is whether the content in the main is the reporting of the news or whether it is serving certain other purposes which are editorial or reflective of a particular administration's policy in that area. That is where I think we get into dangers that I question, on the one hand, and lack of credibility that can flow from very tight and mandatory policy requirements emanating from Washington.

WOULD STATIONS BE PERMITTED TO CARRY ADVERTISING?

Senator AIKEN. Would either Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty be permitted to carry advertising?

Mr. REID. I think that is a question we have not addressed. It is supposed to be a nonprofit corporation, and basically, I suppose, the answer to that is "No," it would not carry advertising. But we would hope that the corporation would raise private funds, that it would move in the direction of the British Council, and that it would not have to rely as heavily as in the past on total Government financing.

Senator AIKEN. At first, it would rely solely on the \$40 million from the Federal Government?

Mr. REID. That would be my understanding, Senator Aiken.

Senator AIKEN. Whether it would carry advertising or not would depend on subsequent decisions.

Mr. REID. I think that would be a subsequent decision of the Board within the nonprofit charter that the Congress might pass.

Senator AIKEN. That is all for now.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Case.

COMMENDATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH RESPONSE

Senator CASE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since my prepared statement has been inserted in the record, I would just like to make a few comments.

Today is a good day for several reasons. In the broader sense it is a good day because we can see actual evidence that some of the things we say from Capitol Hill are heard by the administration downtown and that there is some response to constructive criticism. This is ter-

ribly important because the role of the Congress in foreign relations and in government generally is something that has not been adequately maintained. So, in this instance, I am very happy indeed that our efforts have been recognized by the State Department, by the various administrative agencies, and by the President.

As someone who has not infrequently found it necessary to be somewhat critical of the conduct of the executive branch, I am very happy to have this occasion on which to commend the administration and to express pleasure in having worked together with it.

My pleasure is enhanced by the fact I have been joined by a very agreeable Member of the House who sits in the witness chair now and whose friendship I have enjoyed for many years, and whose progress as a member of this Congress, I have noted with extraordinary satisfaction.

I very much agree with what he has said this morning.

Senator AIKEN. I would like to ask one more question.

Senator CASE. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF SIMILAR COMMUNIST STATIONS COVERING UNITED STATES

Senator AIKEN. These two broadcasting stations, which are supported by our Government, are supposedly anti-Communist in nature. What would be the attitude of the United States if any of the Communist countries established similar stations in Cuba or some other place where they can cover most of the United States? Has the administration taken a position on that?

Mr. REID. I think that is an excellent question.

Senator AIKEN. I thought it was, too. [Laughter.]

#### GUIDANCE AS TO CONTENT AND HANDLING

Mr. REID. Senator Aiken, I might just say I noted in my brief remarks, that perhaps, this was not the place to get into the mechanics of the guidance from Washington, but I do have guidances in my folder, if you are interested in looking at them. These guidances emanate initially from Munich, and then go to Washington where they are reviewed; and at some point, in some cases, are changed, although I am told that is fairly rare. But one of them that I am looking at right now has the word "mandatory" on it. And what that reflects, I would assume, is very clear and explicit guidance as to the content and how the play of the news should be handled in the light of this mandatory guidance. This one happened to be on Rumania. There are other guidances that I have seen on the change in government in Germany and on China.

If I were a newsman or an editor reading the instructions, I would think they were extraordinary explicit.

Senator AIKEN. I think that is probably a question for Mr. Hillenbrand. That is all.

I thank you for the time, Senator Case.

(Letter and daily guidance summaries follow:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1971.

HON. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,  
Chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,  
1215 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It was a privilege appearing before your Committee yesterday, and as per our conversation, I am enclosing several Daily Guidance Summaries.

These are drafted in Munich and reviewed by the State Department and the CIA in Washington. You will note that some are optional, others mandatory. Further, I am told that there are overall guidance summaries prepared annually for each country to which the sections broadcast.

At best, these guidance summaries inject serious editorializing into the content of the broadcast, and at worst reflect a series of policy judgments that could be counter-productive and reflect archaic cold war points of view. Certainly, by any reasonable test, they vitiate any concept of independence for the stations, and in my view should be specifically proscribed in any legislation.

With warm regards.

Sincerely yours,

OGDEN R. REID.

APRIL 16, 1971.

DAILY GUIDANCE: UNITED STATES-CHINA CONTACTS—A BEGINNING?

The suddenness with which the United States table tennis team was invited to mainland China and the rapid pace of developments in U.S.-CPR relations during the past seven days have inevitably aroused great interest throughout the world—an interest that has been well reflected in the volume of comments on the visit appearing in news medias both in the West and in the Communist world. The unusually large coverage given to these developments is, on the whole, justified. During the past seven days more has taken place as regards American-Chinese relations than at any time during the past two decades.

In the first place, the Chinese willingness to invite the U.S. team to China has brought about the first instance of people-to-people contacts between Communist China and the U.S. The appearance of the American sportsmen in Peking and other Chinese cities is therefore an event of major significance in the history of Communist Chinese-U.S. relations.

The meaning of these first, informal contacts has been further enhanced by Premier Chou En-Lai's remarks during a reception in Peking earlier this week. The Premier, after recalling American-Chinese contacts prior to the Communist take-over of the mainland, expressed his opinion that the acceptance by the U.S. team of the Chinese invitation opened a "new page" in the relations between the two peoples. "Americans will come in the future, including correspondents in batches," the Premier was also reported as having said.

The past few days have already brought about a favorable development in this respect. A number of correspondents working for American news media have entered the CPR and indications are that their reporting will not be restricted to the coverage of the table tennis team's visit (Tillman Durdin of the New York Times has reportedly received a one-month visa and is on his way to Peking.)

In addition to the visits of correspondents it is likely that in the future visits by students, scholars and businessmen will also be made possible. The United States in July 1969 lifted all restrictions on travel to China by people who would come under the above categories. Quite recently, in a further gesture designed to encourage contacts between the two countries, the U.S. lifted all restrictions on travel to China by United States citizens, a move that would make it possible for American tourists to visit the Mainland.

Finally, a statement made by President Nixon two days ago made it clear that the United States is seriously considering the easing of restrictions which thus far barred all but minimum trade between American and the CPR and is interested in actually encouraging trade contacts in the future. All this has been in line with the steady efforts of the United States administration shown during the past two years to help American-Chinese relations develop in line with the mutual interests of the two peoples.

All these developments, however, do not mean that a meaningful improvement in the political, economic, cultural and person-to-person contacts of the two

countries will be an easy and quick process. Although American business circles are definitely interested in exploring the Chinese market for possibilities of bilateral trade, it is questionable if China in the near future could become a trade partner of any real significance to the United States. Yet, the obvious limitations should not and probably will not discourage future business contacts and visits by U.S. businessmen to such important expositions of Chinese foreign trade as the bi-annual Canton Trade Fair.

In the field of political relations, the problems are even more formidable. The United States favors the resumption of U.S.-Chinese ambassadorial talks in Poland at any time convenient to the Chinese side. Yet it must be remembered that during the past sixteen years the ambassadorial talks resulted in no agreement on the major issues under discussion. Of all the outstanding issues the problem of Taiwan remains the most important and the most complicated. While interested in reducing the long-standing tensions between the U.S. and the CPR, and in seeking to resolve existing differences and to move toward a more constructive relationship, the United States is also determined not to sacrifice the interests of the Republic of China on Taiwan. Peking, on the other hand, is believed still to insist on the complete abandonment by America of the Nationalist regime of President Chiang Kai-shek as a precondition for a meaningful dialogue with the United States.

This and other outstanding issues therefore continue to block the way of American-Chinese relations in the political field. However, there is an interesting aspects of American-Chinese relations that could, in the long run, favorably contribute to the establishment of normal contacts. This aspect lies in the traditional ties of friendship between the American and Chinese peoples.

This friendship as created over a period of several decades by the frequent contacts of American scholars, educational institutions and—not less importantly—by religious organizations with their Chinese counterparts. Joint struggle against a common opponent in World War II strongly reinforced the tradition of friendship. Those contacts were, however, interrupted by the Communist takeover in 1949. One may speculate that these historic Sino-American ties at one time reinforced the great shock and bitterness in the United States at the takeover of the mainland by a stridently anti-American Chinese regime. However, there are many indications that the basic feelings of friendship remain and could under certain conditions again become a force in the relations between the two countries.

The Soviet leadership during the past years has looked upon any attempt at establishing contacts between the U.S. and Communist China with distinct suspicion. The Soviet Press reaction to the U.S. Table Tennis team's visit to the CPR has thus far far indicated no change in this attitude. Yet, a number of times the United States has expressed its determination not to get involved in the ideological and political conflict between Moscow and Peking, and it has been stated clearly by American Government spokesmen that the recent moves to improve relations with Mainland China have in no way been intended to influence Soviet-Chinese relations. East European media have so far reacted with restraint.

All BDS cover the recent developments and future prospects of U.S.-Chinese relations along the above lines, using Western and Communist press comments, and avoiding overly enthusiastic predictions on the immediate improvement of overall contacts. For a useful review of the historic aspects of U.S.-Chinese contacts, see Benjamin Welles' article in yesterday's the New York Times (F-68 of April 15).

RFE GUIDANCE NOTE No. 107, APRIL 28, 1971

Rumania defends economic sovereignty following the signing of the New Soviet-Rumanian friendship treaty last July. Rumania has undoubtedly shown a more accommodating approach than before in its relations with Comecon, agreeing to work closely with Intermetall and to join Interchim in late 1970, and to join the New Investment Bank in January of this year. But this has never meant that Rumania was prepared to abandon the insistence on political and economic sovereignty that has been the hallmark of its policy in recent years.

As if to dispel any doubt on the subject that may have arisen in either East or West, Rumanian media have since the first of the year argued with increasing vigor for the principles of sovereignty and independence, not only in the economic sphere but in all spheres of international relations. In the first issue of Lumea (7 January 1971), for example, it was argued (By A. Cristescu) that "not only

does each State have supremacy over its own territory but it also exercises sovereignty in its relations with all other States" and that a "State cannot submit the problems which are exclusively in its area of competence to be solved by another State or to be subjected to international examination."

This broader framework of the principles of international relations has established the basis for Rumania's continued rejection of any encroachment on economic sovereignty through majority rule or other moves toward the exertion of supranational control in the economic sphere. It has also provided the rationale for the Rumanian position on the right of each Comecon member to opt in or out of any particular co-operative scheme both at its founding and during its subsequent development. In short Rumania has insisted that the Comecon statutes and the reassurances of other members on the principles of International Socialist Relations in the economic sphere be taken literally and has categorically rejected suggestions that "changes should be made in the meaning of internationalism in the contemporary era (or) that supranational economic and political integration represents the only chance of survival" (C. Lazarescu in the March issue of *Lupta De Clasa*, Rumanian P.S. No. 881, 6 April 1971).

On the eve of the 50th anniversary of the party the Rumanian stress on these principles and on the independent role of each communist party and State has grown. In his speech 24th Party Congress earlier this month (on 1 April) Ceausescu again took the opportunity to point out that the diversity of economic, social and historical situations of the Socialist States could lead to some differences of view which must be settled on the basis of "Free Consent, in the spirit of the Marxist-Leninist principles and the principles of socialist internationalism, of respect for national independence and sovereignty, equal rights and non-interference in internal affairs, of comradely mutual assistance of reciprocal advantage." Shortly thereafter a major article in *Scanteia* (on 6 April, see Rumanian SR/14, 14 April 1971) strongly reiterated the Rumanian Party's independent stand. At the just concluded Bulgarian CP Congress the Rumanian Delegate Gheorghe Pana repeated essentially what Ceausescu had said in Moscow.

Now in the April issue of *Probleme Economice* an article by Ilie Radulescu, a member of the Central Committee and of the Academy of Social and Political Sciences—not Gheorgu Radulescu, Rumania's permanent representative to Comecon—strongly reasserts Rumania's reservations of economic integration. The only version as yet available in Munich is a condensed text made available by *Agerpres* on 24 April (contained in weekend monitoring report No. 192).

In the article, the "generally varied principles of interstate relation" on which economic co-operation must be built are outlined, and it is asserted that: "Disregard of one principle or another, economic pressure of any kind, or interference of internationalism would only create asperity, mistrust and contradictions between socialist states which evidently would affect their relationship on the whole."

The author then turns to more specific concerns. He accepts the socialist international division of labor as necessary, but argues that while it can apply to the "specialization of enterprises, to their co-operation, to co-operation between various branches of national production, between various sectors of economic and financial activity," one cannot accept concepts according to which the socialist international division of labor should allegedly lead to a specialization of the national economies, to the foundation of socialist national-economic complexes, conceived outside the sovereign authority of the socialist states, of respect for their national frontiers.

He goes on to reject the idea strongly stressed now in Soviet and other East European thinking, economy of the socialist countries as a "unitary national economy," claiming that such an approach would limit the development of certain states and perpetuate unequal levels of economic development. He rejects views which "counterpose the international to the national," which minimize the role of national efforts.

Radulescu then counterattacks with the "infant industry" argument. He notes that the economic position of the socialist countries is often looked upon from a static perspective which ignores the demands of development and modernization. He insists that a modern industrial base is essential for each country, saying that to absolutize the industrial situation of some socialist countries and draw general conclusions from it so as to deny the need for the development of some new economic units and branches in the other socialist countries is contrary to the real demands of economic progress and of the deepening of international economic co-operation.

To a degree the arguments presented here in the Agerpres version of Radulescu's article appear to be overly defensive, harking back as they do to issues which were presumably settled in the early 1960's and arguing for the concept of "leveling" which has been reaffirmed a number of times as a long range Comecon goal. However, even allowing for possible slanted excerpting by Agerpres, the strong objections to supranationalism and to any downgrading of Rumania's industrial development at this time reflect Rumania's principled reaction to the thrust of the Comecon integration drive of the past year. Since the 24th Comecon Council Session of a year ago the USSR has pushed with increasing vigor for "integration," and the concept itself has taken on more meaning connotations, at least in its longer-range and ideological implications. Moreover, some notably the East Germans, appear to be trying to use this toughening Soviet attitude in the opportunistic pursuit of their own aims, among the chief of which is to maintain their technological supremacy over the rest of Eastern Europe. With the finalization of Comecon's integration program due shortly it appears that Rumania's concerns with the principles of Comecon relations and with the practical implications of multilateral specialization in advanced industries have both been involved in the current discussions. These discussions have centered on questions of who will invest and specialize in which forms of production and what criteria will be applied in making these decisions.

Having recently agreed to co-operate more fully in Comecon, Rumania evidently feels that strict concurrence with the principles on which Comecon has up to now developed is even more essential to the preservation of its sovereignty. This is why it feels constrained to register strongly and often its objections to the current motions of Comecon integration, which though not yet clearly spelled out, have become sufficiently known to cause concern in Bucharest.

The Rumanian BD, which in the recent past has aired several programs designed to correct the impression gained from western press evaluation on Rumania's "rejoining the fold" will not return to this theme for the time being. All other BD's cross-report along the above lines.

#### RFE DAILY GUIDANCE SUMMARY FOR MAY 4, 1971

Honecker's succession signals no change in East German course.

In a move that has long been anticipated by his few friends and many foes, the long-time leader of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED), Walter Ulbricht, has relinquished his rule over the East German regime. Ulbricht's resignation from his post as first secretary of the SED Central Committee was apparently a result of deteriorating health which, combined with advanced age, has begun to make it impossible for him to retain his grip on the party and state apparatus of the GDR.

Ulbricht's resignation as leader of the party comes six weeks before the eighth Congress of the SED is to meet in East Berlin. It is very probable that the move has been timed to ensure that by the time the Congress convenes the leadership of the party will be firmly under the control of the new first secretary, Erich Honecker.

The change of the leadership in the GDR comes only months after the fall of Gomulka and the rise of Gierek in Poland. Which resulted from the upheaval in Polish coastal cities. In Czechoslovakia, the third element of Gomulka's earlier dream of a "northern tier," top leadership was alternated twice within a rather brief period of time. Thus, the northern tier is now ruled by men relatively newly arrived at the Communist summit and each leader faces a daunting complex of unresolved problems. At the same time, the replacement at the top in all three countries are dramatic examples of the immutable laws of change which even totalitarian leaders must face, however reluctant they are to do so.

Indications are that in an effort to ensure an orderly transfer of power and the continuation of the politics carried out by him for over two decades, Ulbricht has carefully groomed Erich Honecker for the job. The new leader of the SED, who was elected first secretary by a unanimous vote of the central committee yesterday, is a man of a somewhat different background. At 53, Honecker is almost 20 years younger than his predecessor. Besides, the new five year secretary lacks the experience of long years of exile in the Soviet Union, having spent a decade in Hitler's prisons and concentration camps, he was freed from imprisonment by advancing units of the Soviet Army in 1945.

Yet, in outlook, as well as in mentality, Honecker is very much like his former boss Walter Ulbricht, whom he strongly admires. His statements during the past

years give no reason to believe that in his approach toward the major political problems facing the East German regime Honecker will take a course substantially different from that trodden by Ulbricht during the past decades. His statement, made immediately after having been elected to the job of first secretary, is a ringing reiteration of following the "Ulbricht Road." "I express the certainty," Honecker maintained, "that there will be continuity with a carrying on of our firm and sure course. . . ." The unlikeliness of any change for the better in East German approaches to major political issues during the immediate future was also voiced by the spokesman of the West German Government last night. As government spokesman Ahlers put it, Ulbricht's resignation and the appointment of Erich Honecker would not bring with it "essential political changes" in East Germany. In fact, Ahlers expressed that Honecker's appointment might have a negative effect on East-West German relations.

In spite of Ulbricht's apparent attempt to achieve orderly transition of power within the party and government apparatus, it remains to be seen whether he is to succeed in the long run. The leadership of the SED has shown itself to be a fairly united body under the strong rule of Walter Ulbricht. Unpopular and even hated as he was, Ulbricht demonstrated great political skill (frequently bordering on opportunism) in dealing with political matters and personalities both within his own party and vis-a-vis the rest of the Communist bloc. Toward the end of his career he managed to establish himself as something of a doyen of the international communist leadership, the man who knew Lenin, and one whose career goes back to the times when the Comintern was still a force to be reckoned with.

His hand-picked successor, Erich Honecker, has none of this prestige at his disposal. A life-long Communist and party functionary, Honecker still has to prove himself as the holder of the top party job. Among other things, he must be able to keep the leadership of the SED free of internal strife, forestall any struggle for power and retain at least the appearance of unity of the ranks.

Ulbricht's retirement and Honecker's succession is likely to be accepted with some relief by the leaders of the CPSU and the Communist regimes of Eastern Europe. Brezhnev's congratulatory message to Honecker asserted the high assessment by the Soviet leadership of his "contribution to the strengthening of the fraternal friendship and cooperation" between the Soviet party and the SED. Yet, in spite of his record, as the new head of the East German party Honecker is an unknown factor in East European politics, one that can be correctly appreciated only after a certain period of actual political performance.

For the time being, however, it appears that Honecker, U as first secretary of the SED, will not change the ideological position of the East German party or the inflexible, hard-line approach of the GDR toward domestic and international affairs. Although Ulbricht has retired from real political activity, his working style and his Weltausschauung are likely to dominate the GDR scene for some time to come.

All BDS comment on Ulbricht's resignation along above lines and using world reaction as indicated in recommended list.

#### RFE GUIDANCE OPTIONAL SUMMARY FOR APRIL 23, 1971

##### CHANGES IN POLISH AGRICULTURAL POLICY

It has been in the agricultural sector—still overwhelmingly private—that the PUWP under Gierek's leadership has so far made the greatest changes in Poland's longer-term economic policies. The most recent agricultural policy changes for the 1971-1975 plan period were approved at a joint meeting of the PUWP CC held on April 14 and reported by Edward Babiuch at the Ninth Plenum of the PUWP CC held two days later.

Joint recommendations on several important questions have been made to the government. These include: (1) the abolition, as of 1 January 1972, of compulsory delivery of slaughter animals, grain and potatoes; (2) the establishment, as of 1 January 1972, of a comprehensive social insurance program (including, presumably, the provision of old age pensions) for private farmers; (3) the imposition of a revised and increased progressive land tax as means of compensating the agricultural development fund for the loss it will suffer following the abolition of low-priced compulsory deliveries; (4) an expansion of the uses to which the resources in the agricultural development fund can be put so as to include investments other than those for agricultural machinery; (5) the adop-

tion of measures which will ensure the required quantities and range of agricultural production resources for the intensification of production; (6) the improvement of procurement and delivery procedures, of the contract procurement system and of the processing of agricultural output; (7) the establishment of norms which will ensure the realization of greater benefits from agricultural resources and the protection of agricultural and forest resources; (8) the further development of village self-government.

Prior to the April 14 joint recommendations, a number of medium-term and short-run agricultural policy decisions were taken. Most of the earlier decisions were directed toward reinvigorating the livestock sector. More grain was to be imported, although this often acted merely as an offset to the losses resulting from a bad grain harvest. Luckily, potato production in the private sector rebounded well, enabling it to provide for 1971 are not much larger than those supplied in the previous year, the promise has been made to maintain larger minimum concentrated feed supplies for the four remaining years of the new five-year plan. Gomulka's dogmatic plan to end grain imports at any cost—which played a large part in creating the difficulties experienced by the Polish agricultural sector—has been abandoned. Higher procurement prices for meat and animal products were guaranteed for two years, reversing the previously unprofitable character of livestock production. All these programs should help to restore growth in this sphere.

The events of last December played a major role in bringing about significant changes in Poland's agricultural policy. Open criticism of past policies became possible and spread throughout the country, bringing to everyone's attention the plight of the farmers and the production difficulties facing agriculture, as well as their repercussions on the living standards not only of those living in rural areas also—and primarily—of those residing in the towns and cities.

The policy recommendations approved in April are broader in that they go beyond the livestock sector, affecting not only conditions for productions in many agricultural sectors but also living standards in the rural areas. The new farm program has been outlined, some additional resources have been promised and financial conditions for production have been improved. However, much greater economic resources will have to be directed into the agricultural sector if the new program is to have a reasonable change of success. Other desiderata are the removal of the (generally admitted) bureaucratic crust, the completion of the promised expansion of rural self-government, and honest implementation of the policy of uniform treatment for all types of agricultural units, including the private farms.

Although many of the recommendations for changes in agricultural policy have yet to be detailed by the Government, they undoubtedly represent a reversal of the thinking which led to the neglect of agricultural, of particular significance in this regard is the fact that the new proposal in effect explicitly deal with the problems of the individual farmer and, if implemented properly, will end many of the long-time problems that the latter have encountered in terms of both the profitability of their farms and a sense of security. These changes point to a recognition by the new party leadership of the importance of the agricultural sector as a basis for the improvement of the Polish people's economic well-being.

The Polish BD will continue to discuss the problem of agricultural and agriculture policy in its programming, following closely the proper implementation or lack thereof of the regime's stated good intentions. Any cross-reporting by the other BD's should be along the above lines. The attentions of editors is called to the 334-trend paper of April 22, "Polish Agricultural Problems and the Post-Gomulka Agricultural Policy."

#### DAILY GUIDANCE SUMMARY FOR MARCH 31, 1971

#### BREZHNEV'S REPORT TO THE 24TH CPSU CONGRESS

To characterize Brezhnev's report briefly, it might be described as an effort at consolidation along well-known lines and an attempt at refurbishing the image of the Soviet regime. The attempts at consolidation are most noticeable when the General Secretary speaks on topics of external relations, but are also apparent in the discussion of domestic issues. The effort to improve the USSR's public relations image is evident in the discussion of a number of proposals for peace and disarmament. The impression left by the five hours exercise is that while there are some new formulations, the Soviets' essential tactics and fundamental objectives have not changed.

On relations within the "Socialist Camp" Brezhnev desires closer economic and political cooperation. His references to "economic integration" and to "tying together national economic plans more closely" are indicative of Soviet efforts to control Eastern Europe's economic relations with the outside world and to manage Comecon's economic affairs along lines consonant with Soviet economic interest. The call for "international conferences" to be included regularly in the practice of the World Communist Movement (WCM) and reference to the "successes in coordinating the foreign policy activity of the fraternal parties and states" would seem calculated to justify and intensify the Soviets' role as director of Eastern European external affairs and to discourage any independent foreign initiatives. His remarks on negative phenomena such as "Rightist and Leftist Revisionism and Nationalism" which have occurred in the Communist movement are indicative of the Soviet leadership's continuing sensitivity to independent initiatives by some parties.

The criticism of "Nationalism" may well be intended for Bucharest and Belgrade while "left-wing revisionism" is the term usually applied to the Chinese. In addition, so that none of Moscow's East European "Allies" will be confused as to Soviet resolve, the general secretary reemphasized the mission of the Warsaw Pact forces in "extraordinary conditions created by the forces of imperialism and counter-revolution" to demonstrate that the "socialist countries" are not about to "give away their revolutionary achievements, that the borders of the socialist community are indestructible and inviolable."

The CPSU leader asserted personally for the first time the "invitation" thesis contained in the "lessons from the critical development" in Czechoslovakia which the CPCS published last December and which was widely believed at the time to have been issued as a face-saving device in time for the 24th CPSU Congress, of course Brezhnev's repetition of the "imperialist lie" contained in the "lessons" hardly lends it any greater degree of credibility. In contrast, Brezhnev's remark on the Polish scene may be read as a pat on the back for Gierek and an expression of relief that the Red Army did not have to extend its "fraternal assistance" to Poland. His statement that the "difficulties" in that country had been "overcome" and that the Polish party is carrying out measures to "consolidate" socialism met with some scepticism from radio Zagreb commentator HRZIC who questioned the basis for such optimism, stating that "it is clear to everybody, and especially to Poles, that the difficulties have not been overcome." One can, however, agree with Brezhnev that (given the invasion of Czechoslovakia and the Polish December events) "the past five-year period has made a considerable contribution to the treasure-house of the collective experience of the fraternal countries and parties." Indeed, several of the contributions to this "treasure house" are reflected in the general secretary's expressions of concern for the Soviet worker and consumer and his admonition to that procrustean transmission belt, the Soviet trade unions, to defend the legitimate needs of the Soviet workers. This concern is clearly a reflection of the Polish December events.

Concerning relations with other "socialist countries" Brezhnev was quite firm in asserting Soviet national interests (i.e. territorial claims) over compromise with the Chinese. Naturally, he blamed Peking for the hostilities which occurred in 1969 and accused the Chinese leadership of an anti-Soviet line which splits this unity of the Communist movement thereby objectively aiding the imperialists. In addition, he condemned the Chinese for setting up "Marxist-Leninist Parties" and forming blocs with the Trotskyites in an effort to establish "a counterweight in the international Communist movement." Despite his observation that relations have shown some signs of "normalization" over the last 18 months "as a result of initiative displayed on our part," nothing appears to have been settled between the two Communist giants and the only improvement ascertainable since 1969 is the absence of armed combat on the Sino-Soviet frontier. The Chinese, who are not attending the Congress, will probably not let Brezhnev's observations go without a rebuttal.

While Brezhnev listed Yugoslavia among the socialist nations, his references to the desires of the Soviet people to see socialism in Yugoslavia strengthened and its ties with socialist states become firmer" drew an icy rejoinder from radio Zagreb's HRZIC who recognized that Brezhnev was finding fault with Yugoslav socialism. No doubt Tito's disinclination to accede to Soviet wishes and attend the 24th Congress was in part responsible for Brezhnev's pejorative references.

On the international scene Brezhnev tried to paint an image of a peaceloving USSR making lots of initiatives for settling international problems. As if to

underscore his sincerity, the Soviet negotiator at the disarmament conference in Geneva, Roshchin has accepted a western proposal to deal with disarmament in the areas of bacteriological and chemical warfare as separate entities Brezhnev dusted off several old disarmament concepts which have been floated in the past. Most of these, while they cannot be dismissed out of hand, seem to be in the general nature of oratory calls for abolishing arms of a universal basis which have proved impractical in the past. For instance, the support for a ban on all nuclear chemical and bacteriological weapons and on all nuclear weapon testing "by everyone everywhere" or the call for a five-power conference including China and France to discuss nuclear disarmament (when the Soviet Union and the United States have yet been unable to achieve any agreement in the salt talks) are clearly efforts, however unconvincing, to demonstrate that the CPSU is a party of peace. Other proposals, such as the liquidation of all foreign bases and the dissolution of the——

—— (PAGE 3 missing) ——

is scheduled for the CPSU, the first in 17 years, and also announcing a reduction in Cosplan. Brezhnev may be preparing the way for settling the issue with his political opponents.

In another novelty, Brezhnev stated that party Congresses would now take place only every five years. Thus they will coincide with the introduction of five-year plans.

Brezhnev was clearly concerned about the ideological orientation of writers, youth and the Soviet people in general. He particularly attacks writers who criticize present-day Soviet reality and who have "irreversibly receded into the past as a result of the work done by the party to surmount the consequences of the personality cult." This would seem to be a reference to Solzhenitsyn. He also criticized those writers who try to "beautify the phenomena of the past which the party has decisively and principally criticized." He is concerned about the fact that many young people do not have the proper ideological orientation, citing the fact that over half of the Soviet people are under thirty. Not surprisingly, Brezhnev reasserted the party's leading role in culture in line with what he terms the Leninist principle of party-mindedness in directing the development of all forms of creative art. Thus the dead hand of the party will continue to stifle the Soviet creative intelligentsia.

While some observers thought a reassertion of Stalinism might characterize the Congress, Brezhnev specifically condemns the personality cult (Stalin), but he balances this with a condemnation of "subjective errors" (Krushchev). Brezhnev asserted that the party was loyal to the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and was concerned with a "correct and objective interpretation of Soviet history." This continues the effort to praise general developments in Soviet history from Lenin's death until 1964, while simultaneously condemning past leaders ex post facto for their faults and asserting the real Marxism-Leninism of the present leadership.

Other elements in Brezhnev's speech are his concern for improving Soviet labor productivity in the face of a decline in additions to the labor force and his emphasis on improving the technological base of the USSR (i.e., attempting to bridge the technological gap with the West).

In short, the report of the general secretary is essentially notable for its length and its total lack of new ideas. Its one solid contribution to the improvement of the lot of the Soviet citizen may be that such an address will now be delivered once in five years instead of every four years as heretofore.

All ed's report on Brezhnev's address along the above general lines, using appropriate materials as indicated.

Senator CASE. I am very happy indeed to have had the participation of my senior colleague and to have received his thoughts.

PURPOSE OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, this matter started actively in January of this year when I introduced a short bill to provide for open financing of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

The purpose of the bill was to bring out and terminate the covert governmental support for the two radio stations. CIA had been financing most of their costs for about 20 years, and I had become increasingly uneasy about CIA funding, although I recognized that at the outset clandestine support was probably necessary.

After I introduced my bill, the Department of State put the matter under study. Representative Reid and I had many discussions with State's representatives, who were most diligent and cooperative in working out what I think is a good solution.

I am introducing the administration bill, as Representative Reid is, today; and I look forward to working with the committee in perfecting it.

I agree with Representative Reid that some of the directors of this new body should be appointed by others than the President. I think Congress ought to participate as to appointments as well as confirmation. I think this is a very good idea.

I think we need assurance that CIA participation in the station is going to be terminated, and I agree in that respect with what Mr. Reid has said.

I think that we ought to limit the money appropriated to this body, the American Council, if that be the name given it in the final legislation, to the use of only Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty unless further authorization is granted by Congress. I would expect the administration would follow that policy.

I congratulate the administration, and I'm very happy to have this matter placed before our committee for its consideration. I hope, after the committee does its usual fine job of perfecting the legislation, that it will come up with a favorable recommendation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Spong.

Senator SPONG. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Sparkman.

SOVIET BLOC PRESSURE ON STATIONS

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Congressman, what kind of pressure has the Soviet Union and the bloc countries brought to bear on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty?

Mr. REID. My understanding, Senator Sparkman, is, from time to time, the Soviet Union has raised this question, both informally and formally, with the United States, and most recently in connection with Soviet participation in the Olympics. I believe there has been some question as to whether certain countries would participate in the Olympics if these stations continued.

I think this may be more in the nature of a threat than a reality, but; from time to time, both by virtue of their comments and by virtue of their jamming, I think the Soviet Union has indicated strong irritation at some of the endeavors of these two stations.

Senator SPARKMAN. Have they brought pressure also upon the German Government about the renewal of the permit?

Mr. REID. My understanding is they raised this from time to time with the German Government.

Senator SPARKMAN. There was a story in the Washington Star in July of last year, in which it was stated that there were indications that they would press pretty heavily upon the West German Government against the renewal of the permit.

#### SIMILAR RUSSIAN STATIONS

Does Russia have any similar stations in which she beams messages to the West?

Mr. REID. I think some of them are roughly analogous, and I think there are some that are clandestine as well as open. Nonetheless, it seems to me the question is raised as to whether these stations essentially report the news or whether we are going beyond that in trying to effect policy changes within these governments, and this is the area that I think the committee and the new Board, if this Council comes into being, should look at very carefully.

It is one thing to report news that people should have access to, but it is quite another to further the policy objectives of particular administrations through the vehicles of these stations to the extent that that is true.

#### DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STATIONS AND VOICE OF AMERICA

Senator SPARKMAN. What is the difference between what these stations do and what the Voice of America does?

Mr. REID. Well, my understanding, which is somewhat inexact, is that Voice of America carries the official U.S. position on all policy questions, whereas the other two stations broadcast a great deal of material that they feel should be fully reported in the several countries.

The breakdown is 16-percent news, about 34-percent commentary. I have some of the news analyses and commentary here. I think the news is pretty balanced and straightforward. The analyses would indicate what various points of view might be relative to a change of government in Germany or to ping-pong diplomacy, in matters of that kind. The balance is sports and music.

Senator SPARKMAN. I may say that I have had the privilege of visiting Radio Free Europe and spent a little time there. I saw it in operation and talked with the officials and with some of the people who were doing the reporting. I was very much impressed with it.

I am pleased that you have come before us to make this presentation.

#### OBJECTIVITY OF RADIO FREE EUROPE'S REPORTING

You served in Europe in connection with the Herald Tribune, did you not?

Mr. REID. Yes, Senator Sparkman, I did.

Senator SPARKMAN. You know something about the crossfires that build up among the nations that way. You know something about objective reporting. Do you consider Radio Free Europe to be doing objective reporting?

Mr. REID. I think the news presentation, from what I can see of the files that have been made available to me, is straightforward and excellent. I think the analysis and commentary is reflective of certain U.S. policy positions at times, and is quite heavyhanded in terms of editorializing. I would give a high rating to news and not as good a rating to the commentary portions of the two stations.

WITNESS' SERVICE IN ISRAEL

Senator SPARKMAN. You served as Ambassador to Israel also?

Mr. REID. Yes, Senator Sparkman. I particularly enjoyed your visit.

Senator SPARKMAN. I remember visiting there when you were the Ambassador.

Mr. REID. It was an official visit when you put in almost as much time as the chairman.

Senator SPARKMAN. We went without our sport shirts down into the desert.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING PROGRAMS BY DIFFERENT GOVERNMENTS

Is there any question, taking your experience in Israel, with reference to radio programs or news programs or whatever there may be put on by different governments of the world?

Mr. REID. Yes, I think there are some very real questions, and I felt that some of the broadcast in the Near East, which were frequently clandestine, did not lower the political climate or enhance diplomatic options, and that is why I think this kind of entity is much better in the private sector with men exercising independent judgment. That is why, as a principle, I feel that the stations should deal essentially with news and lean quite lightly on editorializing and comment, because if we get into that area, it seems to me, we are doing something that other stations in other countries have done, involving ourselves to some degree in internal domestic affairs. No matter how much we may seek to avoid that, that is why I was a bit concerned when I looked at some of the guidances from Washington and from Munich to these stations, because it did not seem to me that it was entirely free from some editorial suggestions; this scenario is something which the committee should very properly look at as to what is the fundamental role.

The role of announcing news and enhancing the flow of ideas in the culture and arts and education is one thing. The setup of stations to further implement U.S. policy objectives, or to undermine certain governments in other countries, it seems to me, is entering a different area and, perhaps, a questionable one.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Congressman Reid.

Mr. REID. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PURPOSE OF U.S. BROADCASTS TO EASTERN EUROPE

Senator CASE. There is one point I would like to pursue with Congressman Reid. I wonder if you would agree with me, and I rather suspect you would, that it is not embarrassing to be asked why we broadcast to Eastern Europe. I am not a bit embarrassed about this

because I agree with you fully that the purpose of this station should not be to propagandize or to editorialize, but rather to be sure that the Russian and other Eastern European peoples have facts about what is going on in the world, and in many cases what is going on in their own countries.

When an open society like the United States deals with a closed society, the conditions for peace and understanding do not exist when the closed society limits the information that its people receive. This is an entirely unfortunate circumstance and one which cannot in the long run be conducive to peaceful relations or peace in the world. To attempt to broaden the understanding of all people, as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty ideally do, would seem to me to require no apologies.

Mr. REID. Senator Case, I agree 110 percent with that. It seems to me when the United States proceeds to open funding and pursues a policy of open communication, we can do it quite well. When we get into areas that are clandestine and murky and not subject to congressional scrutiny, and frequently involving ourselves in matters we should not get into, we do it sometimes not well and, at other times, badly, and I think the strength of this proposal is free, open communication.

Senator CASE. Thank you very much.

Mr. REID. Thank you very much, Senator, and again my compliments on your initiatives in this regard. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness is Assistant Secretary Martin J. Hillenbrand, Department of European Affairs, Department of State.

Mr. Hillenbrand, do you have a prepared statement?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you proceed, please, sir.

#### **STATEMENT OF MARTIN J. HILLENBRAND, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EUROPEAN AFFAIRS**

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I appreciate the opportunity to testify on this bill to provide for the establishment of a corporation to be called the American Council for Private International Communications, Inc., which will support private American organizations active in the field of communication with foreign peoples. This proposal has the full support of Secretary Rogers.

#### **ACTIVITIES AND APPOINTMENT OF COUNCIL**

The Council as it is conceived would make grants to eligible media from funds appropriated by the Congress. The private nature of the Council is designed to enable the media which it supports to fulfill their role as objective reporters and independent commentators, not as spokesmen for the U.S. Government.

The Chairman of the Board of the Council would be appointed by the President, as would the Vice Chairman and the other nine members. All would be selected for their ability to ensure the disbursement of grants in the national interest. The Board would be responsible for assuring that the officers of the Council established adequate liaison with the Department of State.

The Council would annually account to the Congress and its responsible committees for the proper use of grants the Council makes. Through the involvement and interest of the Council's Board members, all of whom would be appointed from private life, the Council would be able to determine that activities of the grantees were exclusively those appropriate to mass-media operations for which they were funded, including news gathering and analysis.

It is foreseen that the Council would use its appropriation primarily to grant funds to two existing private broadcasting corporations, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, which are incorporated respectively in the States of New York and Delaware and which have obtained licenses abroad to transmit programs in their capacity as private organizations.

#### IMPORTANCE OF RADIOS TO LISTENERS AND THE OTHER PEOPLES

I would like to review briefly with the committee the importance of these two radios to the peoples to whom they broadcast and their value to other peoples, including our own who share the view that an informed public is a safeguard of people. I would like especially to underline how important it is that these stations retain their private character.

In regard to the significance of these radios, a principal source for my remarks are my personal observations and those of my colleagues who have served in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. I know of few matters related to this geographic area on which there is such a degree of agreement among us who have served in that area as on the beneficial and constructive roles of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. The service of each radio is in essence the same. Radio Liberty provides to the Soviet Union and Radio Free Europe to most of Eastern Europe a large volume of information and commentary which the peoples of those countries do not receive from other sources, but which they need in order to make informed judgments on public issues. Domestic media in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe speak with a single voice, commonly omitting or distorting coverage of events about which the public has every need to know. In place of full news accounts, questioning editorials, and independent commentary, the daily fare never challenges policies or goals set by the government nor asks how wisely the public's money is being spent. A public so deprived of essential information has difficulty finding ways to promote its own interests with respect either to domestic or to foreign issues.

It is true that international radio services which function as agencies of various governments—the Voice of America, BBC, Deutsche Welle, Radiotransmission et Diffusion Francaise, and others—fill a part of this information void. However, out of well-founded diplomatic considerations, such official government radios must take care to avoid the charge of interference in the internal affairs of other nations.

In my view, there are no fundamental conflicts of interests between the American people and the peoples of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. In many respects, the interest of all these people can be seen to converge. For them as well as for us, large resources which could be allocated to meet human needs are siphoned off for the purposes of other policies. It seems a reasonable assumption that under any sys-

tem an informed public can better alter this situation in the interest of its own welfare than can an uninformed public. I am convinced, as are many of my colleagues, that the input of information by the radios into the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe strengthens the ability of these people to promote their own general welfare. If these peoples do improve their own welfare, it will be possible for us further to reorder our own priorities to the benefit of the American public.

#### RADIOS' SUCCESS IN FULFILLING THEIR PURPOSE

Further, let me stress that the sole purpose of the radios is to disseminate information and to present analyses of that information which are thoughtful and responsible. Those of us who have lived in the reception areas credit the radios with a large measure of success in fulfilling their purpose. This success is borne out by the large listenerships which the radios have attracted. RFE broadcasts in the appropriate language 18 hours a day to Poland, 19 to Czechoslovakia, 18 to Hungary, 12 to Romania, and 7½ to Bulgaria. The result of thousands of interviews conducted by professional, independent polling organizations with visitors from Eastern Europe in the recent past indicate that the RFE audience in the five countries named above is at least 30 million persons. This is about one-half of the total adult population. In certain countries during periods of crises the percentage of listeners has shot up dramatically to 80 or 90 percent of the population over the age of 14. I should add that these large audiences have been developed notwithstanding extensive efforts to jam broadcasts. A significant proportion of the broadcasts gets through even where efforts are made to jam them because the effectiveness of the jamming varies with the time and place, and because of the tenacity of the listeners.

Radio Liberty broadcasts 24 hours a day in Russian, 10 in Byelorussian, 13 in Ukrainian, 4 in Armenian, 4 in Azerbaijani, 4 in Georgian, 4 in North Caucasian languages, 4 in Tatar-Bashkir, and 4 in Turkistani languages. While it is more difficult to arrive at an accurate estimate of the actual size of Radio Liberty's listenership, an indication of its effectiveness is the effort made by the Soviet Government since 1953 to jam around the clock all Radio Liberty frequencies. It is estimated that the jamming network costs the Soviets over six times as much annually to operate as the annual budget of Radio Liberty itself.

While estimates of the number of Radio Liberty listeners are of necessity less precise than those for Radio Free Europe, there is extensive corroborative evidence which shows that, like Radio Free Europe, it has a large and tenacious audience. The costly effort of jamming itself is a clear indicator as are the thousands of references to the programs of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe in the Soviet and Eastern European press. Also, each year, several thousands of letters addressed to Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe get past—or around—the censor or are sent to them by listeners traveling in the West. In these, there is an oft-repeated refrain: "Everybody around here listens to your program." This may be an exaggeration, but it gives some idea of how widely the broadcasts of these radios are listened to. Further evidence comes from foreigners living and working

in these countries, who confirm that these peoples depend on the radios and that a significant proportion of the broadcasts penetrate the jamming. One of my colleagues, fluent in Russian, who recently spent a 2-year tour in the Soviet Union, has said that in all his wide travels in that country he seldom met an individual who did not admit to listening to Radio Liberty.

#### IMPORTANCE OF PRESERVING RADIOS' PRIVATE CHARACTER

The final point I would like to emphasize is the importance of the radios' preservation of their private character. I mentioned that, in contrast to international radios which are identified as government agencies, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe are able to report and comment on the domestic affairs of other nations much as would any commercial medium operating in a democracy. This is the unique character of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and is the key to their continuing value, for the reasons I have given. Additionally, these radios are, in order to prolong their present transmitting licenses, obligated to their host governments to maintain their private character. In recent months, Soviet and Eastern European media have increased their attacks on the radios in an effort to dislodge them or at least seriously curtail their services. In reaction, considerable public and media support for the radios and the principles for which they stand has been evoked in Europe. That good will can best be preserved by enactment of the proposed legislation which will enable the radios to continue to function effectively with their private character unimpaired.

#### GOAL FOR WHICH RADIOS ARE WORKING

Mr. Chairman, we are at a point in the evolution of events in Europe at which we have, perhaps, significant opportunities for meaningful negotiation. This is a welcome situation. But we must bear in mind that our quadripartite negotiations for improvement of the state of affairs in and around Berlin have not yet been successful after many months of discussion. We do not intend, however, to stop trying. Our SALT talks in Vienna have advanced to the point at which, as the President has said, we have agreed with the Soviet Government "to concentrate on working out an agreement for the limitation of deployment of antiballistic missile systems" and, together with that, "to agree on certain measures with respect to the limitation of offensive strategic weapons." It is our hope that we can agree with the Soviet Union on how to relate these issues and how to deal with them to mutual advantage. We now have the prospect of exploring another major issue—mutual balanced force reductions. Mr. Brezhnev has told us, however, that we must drink from that bottle before we find out what wine is in it.

Much more than an atmosphere of negotiations is at stake in these opportunities. At stake is not only the accommodation of divergent Western and Soviet governmental interests, but the basis on which that accommodation is to be reached. Will it be achieved on the basis of a recognized Soviet sphere of influence confronting the NATO alliance? Or will it be achieved on the basis of new and more secure relationships in Europe permitting individual countries to develop

natural and normal economic cultural and informational links with each other? If the second alternative is realized, if a free and open exchange of information develops within and between the individual countries of Europe—the valuable private international media of which I have spoken will no longer have a valid function. This is the goal for which these radios are working. Until that goal is achieved, there is every reason to encourage Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to continue in their present role.

It is for this reason that I wish to stress, in conclusion, that the establishment of the American Council for Private International Communications will be an act fully compatible with the objectives which I believe you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of your committee share with those of us who are engaged in implementing the President's desire to move from confrontation to negotiation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Senator SPARKMAN.

#### RFE AND RL POLICY ORIENTATION

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Secretary, what can you tell us about the policy orientation in Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty? Has their policy orientation changed over the years? Has it, shall I say, mellowed? What is their objective?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I think one can say looking over the broadcasts over the years, that there has been a gradual shift away from the intensity of the confrontation which existed during the height of the cold war period to a more, let us say, equable facing of the news on a day-to-day basis. This we anticipate would continue on into the future.

Under the new system, because the private personalities responsible for the broadcasts and for the operation of these stations would have no reason for changing this, I would anticipate that the dissemination of accurate information about conditions in Eastern Europe and elsewhere would continue to be the primary function of the radios in the future.

#### ATTITUDE OF COUNTRIES RECEIVING PROGRAMS

Senator SPARKMAN. Do I understand correctly that there has been, perhaps, some mellowing by the countries to which the programs are beamed, with reference to trying to black them out or to keep their people from listening to the different programs?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Some of the countries have abandoned jamming of Radio Free Europe. Some continue to jam it. The Soviet Union, as I indicated, does continue an extensive program of jamming Radio Liberty.

Senator SPARKMAN. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Aiken.

#### RADIO IN AMERICAN SECTOR BERLIN

Senator AIKEN. Mr. Hillenbrand, as I understand it, there is a radio station in Berlin that is called RIAS. I do not know what it means. I suppose the capital "I" stands for "Information." The "RAS" is some-

thing else. That is supported partly by the United States and partly by Germany; is that correct?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. The broadcasting facility you are referring to, RIAS, Radio in American Sector Berlin, that is what the RIAS stands for——

Senator AIKEN. Thank you.

Mr. HILLENBRAND (continuing). Is a jointly financed activity. The basic responsibility, however, for the operation of the station is that of the U.S. Government, which, particularly through its informational services, continues to operate the radio in Berlin and continues to be responsible essentially for the programing and for the contents of the broadcasts.

Senator AIKEN. Do you mean the U.S. Government is responsible for the programing?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, through the information services of the USIA; that is correct.

Obviously, this is not a private broadcasting service facility in Berlin. It is not at all analogous to Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty.

Senator AIKEN. Do you know what the German Government's figures have been?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I could provide those figures in executive session if you wish, Senator.

Senator AIKEN. Could you send to the chairman of the committee how much it is costing both the United States and Germany in classified form if it is secret information?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Yes, I can provide that.

(The information referred to is classified and in the Committee files.)

Senator AIKEN. Will the new organization operate RIAS or control it in any way?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. No.

Senator AIKEN. It will not.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. It will not. It will have nothing to do with RIAS.

Senator AIKEN. Why is it that I have had complaints that RIAS sometimes broadcasts material which is not very complimentary to the United States?

Do you know how that gets in there?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I am surprised to hear you say that because certainly that would not——

Senator AIKEN. I am repeating a complaint I received from someone who is very, very familiar with international broadcasting.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, I cannot speak to specific broadcasts because this would certainly not be the general purpose of RIAS, but it is possible that certain rebroadcast of editorials from the American press, which is a common practice among stations of this kind or rebroadcasts of news material which originated in the United States, might have contained certain derogatory remarks. This is quite conceivable. But until we had some specific cases it would be very difficult to say what the reason for them was.

Senator AIKEN. The next time I get one I will send it to you.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Fine.

TOTAL INDEPENDENCE IN RUNNING RFE AND RL

Senator AIKEN. You have been quoted recently in a prominent newspaper as saying you are not trying to close down RFE or RL, that they serve a useful purpose, but that you feel they should be run by a board totally independent of the Government.

What do you mean by "totally independent of the Government" if the Government pays the bills?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Did I understand you correctly to say that I had been quoted?

Senator AIKEN. You are quoted as saying:

We are not trying to close down RFE or RL. They serve a useful purpose, but we feel they should be run by a board totally independent of the government.

That quotation is found in the New York Times. I am informed that it was not you but Congressman Reid who said that. I will go on from that.

Senator CASE. It sounds like a pretty good statement anyway. You might adopt it.

Senator AIKEN. I guess that was for Congressman Reid, that question, and I won't ask him to answer now.

GAO AUDITING

Under the administration's bill, does GAO audit Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty or could it audit only the operations of the Council?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, under the bill the auditing by GAO would be limited to that of the Council. But, presumably, it could work out a relationship with the Council so that information which Congress needed to have in judging as to the appropriateness of use of the moneys that it was appropriating, we really do not know. But the bill provides for auditing by GAO of the Council.

PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS TO RFE AND RL

Senator AIKEN. I understand that RFE and RL have been financed not only by contributions from the CIA, but also by private contributions. Is that correct?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. That is correct.

Senator AIKEN. What was the nature of the private contributors? Were they mostly individuals?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. It has varied. There have been annual fund-raising campaigns for many years in this country. In recent years, I think the tendency has been to move away from sensational and rather elaborate fund-raising campaigns to try to tap corporate funds and large contributors. But there is nothing inherent in the process which makes one or the other of these methods better.

Senator AIKEN. Large contributors having a particular interest in the affairs of Europe, East and West.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I think so, yes.

Senator AIKEN. It would be banks and manufacturing concerns?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Manufacturing concerns, concerns that have extensive export interests and so on.

Senator AIKEN. Yes.

Any foundations?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I do not believe there have been any foundations, but I may be wrong on that. That is something I could check. But, generally, there—

#### BROADCASTS AS CONSIDERATION AT SALT

Senator AIKEN. I also understand that this matter of public relations radio broadcasts could well be considered in the light of or influence the SALT talks, which are impending with a promise of something like good results coming from them. Could the matter of broadcasts also become part of your SALT talks?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, this hardly seems likely since the SALT talks are dealing with the question of strategic arms limitations.

We have, of course, as I indicated, had complaints from various countries of Eastern Europe about the activities of these radios, but these have been of a moderate sort because I think it is understood there are set rules of the game here and the Soviet Union maintains much more extensive broadcasting facilities of an allegedly private nature to supplement their official broadcasts which are beamed to many, many countries of the Western World, including the United States.

For example, Radio Peace and Progress, which broadcasts out of Moscow, is one of these, so that I do not believe, if the direction of your question was to imply that there might be some interference with these negotiations because of the existence of the radios, that this would be a significant factor.

#### COST TO JAM POSSIBLE RUSSIAN BROADCASTS COVERING UNITED STATES

Senator AIKEN. You said that it cost Russia seven or eight times as much to jam our programs as it cost us to broadcast them.

Suppose they established a broadcasting station in some place where it could well cover the United States. Would it cost us seven or eight times as much to jam their programs as it would cost them to send them?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I am not quite sure what the technology would be here, but certainly we would not be interested in jamming them because we do not engage in jamming broadcasts beamed at the United States.

#### LICENSING OF U.S. BROADCAST FACILITIES IN EUROPE

Senator AIKEN. We have broadcast facilities in several countries in Europe.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. The transmitters of Radio Free Europe are the shortwave transmitters located—10 in Germany and 18 in Portugal. There is also a medium wave transmitter in Germany.

As for Radio Liberty transmitters, there are eight for shortwave in Germany, six in Spain, and three in Taiwan, on which time is leased.

Senator AIKEN. Are these broadcast stations licensed by the countries in which they are located? If they were broadcasting openly as U.S. Government radio stations, would they still be licensed?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. They are licensed by the host country and the licenses are granted to these radios as private operations. So any attempt by the United States to engage in such broadcasts would require relicensing *ab initio*. Of course, it would be merely one of the disadvantages of any direct U.S. Government involvement in this kind of activity.

Senator AIKEN. Do you feel that if the proposed legislation were enacted into law, the licensing of these stations would not be, perhaps, so open to question as it is now?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, the licensing, the licenses, are continuingly valid, and there is nothing in this legislation that would change the nature of these stations' operations abroad, and, therefore, presumably relicensing would not be necessary.

Senator AIKEN. They would be licensed the same as they are now.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. That is right.

Senator AIKEN. I think that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Case?

Senator CASE. Thank you.

#### COMMENDATION OF WITNESS

Mr. Secretary, it is nice to have you up here, and I want to express my personal appreciation to you for your efforts in this matter. We have been carrying on discussions with you on RFE and RL for several months, and I am grateful for your cooperation.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Thank you.

#### LIMITATION OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR RFE AND RL

Senator CASE. Neither Radio Free Europe nor Radio Liberty is mentioned in the administration bill, which we plan to introduce today. Of course, we all understand that these two stations would get their money from the new Council, the American Council for Private International Communications.

Can you state for the administration that the money presumably to be appropriated by the Council would be given only to RFE and RL unless Congress specifically authorizes otherwise?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. That is the intent, and Congress would have sufficient safeguarding authority in the procedures which the bill contains to prevent any other use of these funds unless it were willing to authorize them. There is nothing in the bill which would make it inherently impossible if Congress agrees.

Senator CASE. I understand, but in the absence of additional congressional authorization, money for the American Council will only go to RFE and RL.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. That is correct.

Senator CASE. You would expect to come to Congress if that intent were changed?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. That is correct.

Senator CASE. I am very happy to have that assurance.

(The following information was subsequently supplied:)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE VIEWS ON THE EXPENDITURE OF \$40 MILLION SOUGHT FOR  
AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

The sum originally requested for the Council was \$40 million. It is estimated that \$21,706,000 would be granted to Radio Free Europe and \$14,460,000 to Radio Liberty. A substantial part of this total estimated expenditures of \$36.2 million is in German Marks. The \$36.2 million estimate is based on the rate of \$1-3.66 DM, the previous fixed rate. As the dollar relationship to the mark "floats," it is not easy to predict exactly what the dollar cost of the operations of the Radios in FY 1972 will be. Certainly it will not be less than \$36.2 million—very possibly it will be 3-4% more. For each one percent drop in the exchange rate, the annual costs of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe rise an approximate \$300,000.

There will be an additional amount of approximately \$500,000 annually required for the operations of the American Council for International Communications, Inc.

Inasmuch as the Council, if established according to the proposed legislation, would be empowered to consider grants to other grantees in the field of private international communications, some funds for the examination of such projects and for small initial grants were envisaged. Should the Congress desire that, until the next authorization, the Council make grants only to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, such funds would not be required.

BROADER BASE FOR APPOINTMENTS TO BOARD

Senator CASE. I wonder if there would be any objection from the administration if the Board of the American Council were somewhat more broadly based in its appointment, perhaps including nominees by the Speaker of the House and President pro tempore of the Senate, so as to strengthen the separation between the Government of the United States, as such, and the corporation?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, in setting up this system, we were drawing essentially on the experience in the legislation which established the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and Overseas Private Investment Corp. Obviously, there is nothing inherently or intrinsically necessary about this system. It seems to have worked pretty well in these cases, and we think we have provided safeguards for congressional control at all points along the way.

On the other hand, if the Congress feels that this is a desirable change in the legislation, perhaps this could be further discussed at the time when the appropriate committees are considering amendments.

Senator CASE. Thank you, sir.

ANNUAL AUTHORIZATION OF AMERICAN COUNCIL APPROPRIATION

One of the questions that affects us and to which this committee is properly sensitive and alert, is whether, in foreign policy matters, this committee's jurisdiction should not be strengthened. To that end what would be the administration position on whether the American Council's appropriation should not be authorized each year instead of being scrutinized only as a regular proposition by the Appropriations Committees of Congress.

I wonder if you think there would be any problem in providing in the legislation before us that the American Council's authorization as well as appropriation of funds be considered annually?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, once again, we thought we had built enough safeguards into the procedures.

Senator CASE. You are looking at Congress as a whole, and we are looking at Congress internally in its various functioning instrumentalities. Perhaps it is not a fair question for you, but let me ask it this way: You would have no difficulty in coming to this committee and discussing annually the operations of this Council, would you?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, there was certainly no intent to avoid any particular part of Congress.

Senator CASE. I understand. And you would have no difficulty if the authorization had to be renewed annually?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I think we could face that.

Senator CASE. You think you could face that. You are very nice to put it that way, and I will accept that as as much of an assurance from you as I can get.

I think that covers the questions that have not been already covered by my colleagues or by you in your direct presentation. I again want to express my appreciation to you and your associates in the Department for your cooperation.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Thank you, Senator.

Senator CASE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

#### PURPOSE OF ORIGINAL BILL

The CHAIRMAN. When the Senator from New Jersey, Senator Case, introduced his original bill I thought the sole purpose was to put on the public record the truth about the appropriations bill for the funding of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, of which purpose I thoroughly approve.

#### HAVE OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES CONTRIBUTED TO OPERATION?

Could you tell us, Mr. Hillenbrand, is the CIA the only Government agency which has directly contributed to the operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty? Has the State Department or any other agency contributed?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I can assure you that the State Department did not. Perhaps this is something, the past history here, which could best be most fully discussed in an executive session.

The CHAIRMAN. Why, Mr. Hillenbrand?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, because there are certain sensitivities here which involve other governments as well as our own.

The CHAIRMAN. The sensitivity, as far as I am concerned, is your disposition to conceal everything from this committee.

#### STATE DEPARTMENT REFUSAL OF BERLIN TROOP COSTS TO GAO

I was very offended at your refusal to allow the Government Accounting Office, working under the direction of this committee, access to the records of the cost of supporting our troops in Berlin and the contributions by the Germans.

Could you explain why you did that?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, I might say to begin with, that this whole matter is now under intensive review, and we hope to be able to communicate with you further on the subject in the near future.

The CHAIRMAN. You communicated already. I had an official response from the GAO that you had directed your office to refuse to make available to the GAO these figures. Is that not correct?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Why not explain it now? What is the reason for that?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, the reason—the reasons which were contained in the letter to the head of General Accounting Office had to do with the essentially tripartite nature of the funding process for Berlin occupation costs, and the fact this was not a unilateral American program.

Moreover, there were a number of sensitive aspects to the question which our Ambassador in Bonn felt were overriding. Moreover, this is not primarily a matter for the State Department, but of other Government departments, and we had to take into consideration the attitude of those departments.

Those are the basic reasons of the negative position which I took in this letter.

Now, as I say, we are reconsidering whether in the light of your communication and the other objections that have been raised, whether we cannot perhaps, adopt a different attitude. But I am not yet in position to speak on behalf of the U.S. Government on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. It is American money, about which we were asking, not what other governments put in. The essential point was whether or not the Germans maintain their fair agreed-upon contribution to the support of those troops. It did not concern other governments. We only asked how much our taxpayers were required to put into this operation. It never occurs to you that the Congress and this committee are also sensitive to the present tendency of the State Department, as has always been true of some of the others, to refuse to give us information.

Does it ever occur to you that we are sensitive, too, about being hornswoggled by the departments?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, I believe that the information which this committee would want in this particular area of activity could be provided.

The CHAIRMAN. It was not provided. It was refused to the GAO. That is the proper agency of the Congress to know this. I do not think it is at all proper for you to take this arrogant attitude that we are not entitled to know how the money, which we have voted, is spent. I do not think this deception is acceptable. I see no reason whatever for your refusing the Congress, who has to appropriate the money and has appropriated it, and saying, "No, we can't give the GAO that."

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, the moneys involved here, of course, were not appropriated by the Congress. They were——

The CHAIRMAN. They were not?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. They, in this particular case, were provided by the German authorities under the Berlin occupancy cost budget.

The CHAIRMAN. But the agreement was to pay the costs of our occupation forces in Berlin; was it not?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. If they don't pay it, it has to come out of the Congress; doesn't it?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. That is right, if they don't pay it, but they are paying.

## STATE DEPARTMENT REFUSAL OF BERLIN TROOP FIGURES TO GAO

The CHAIRMAN. How do we know it? This is just the point. You refused to allow the GAO to see whether they are paying it or not. We cannot take your word on faith always, because we have been deceived too often. I think, occasionally, you should allow our people to have access to the facts. I do not think it is acceptable that if the Germans do not pay it we have to pay it eventually. Somebody has to pay for those troops. This matter does not involve only this committee. There are at least 36 Members of the Senate who think we spend too much for the other forces, too.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, Mr. Chairman, all I can say at this point is that I hope we would be able to communicate with you shortly further on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. I have no doubt you will send another letter saying for other reasons you won't make the figures available. That is what you usually do. I do not deny you are reconsidering it, but I do not like it. It casts a grave question about any new operation with which you could do the same thing.

## VOA BUDGET AND SIMILARITY OF OPERATIONS

Mr. Hillenbrand, how much is the Voice of America budget? Could you give us those figures?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I think I can get them for you.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is relevant to this because is not the Voice of America doing very much the same thing as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. While I try to produce the figures I will answer the second portion of your question first, if I may, Mr. Chairman. Actually, the answer is "No," because of the legislative authority which provides for VOA operations. The VOA is essentially committed to providing information about the United States, its people and the policies of the U.S. Government. It does not purport to deal with what is happening in third countries, except to the degree that this is merely a question of the news ticker.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not purport to give news?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Yes; but it does not have the facilities or the purpose to try to find out the details about what is happening in third countries, countries of Eastern Europe in this case, and to broadcast these details. For one thing, it does not have the extensive foreign language facilities. Its foreign language broadcasts in the course of a week to some of the countries in Eastern Europe are hardly equal to one day's broadcasting of Radio Free Europe. The two operations are completely disparate in nature.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't we have a transmitter in the Mediterranean that can reach all of Eastern Europe, including Russia, under the direction of VOA?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. We have the transmitting capacity.

The CHAIRMAN. I will give you the figures. In 1971, the Voice of America budget estimate is \$41,459,000; in 1970, it was \$39,980,000; in 1969, it was \$36,494,000; in 1968, it was \$33,612,000; in 1967, it was \$31,977,000. The 1970 figure is approximately what you are asking

if these stations are to be continued they ought be a part of the annual appropriations. That is out in the open and it is public. But now you come up with a very interesting device for concealing the matter once again. You probably will conceal it and say it is for executive session only. We are going to pretend this is under private direction.

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt?

The CHAIRMAN. It will not be. I do not like the turn this has taken. I would support simply putting a line item in an appropriation bill and fighting it out. Are we willing to continue to proliferate the propaganda agencies on which we spend many millions of dollars, a great deal more money than we will spend on the legitimate information, educational—I mean radio domestically. I think it has taken a turn which I did not anticipate.

This device of a board which you appoint and which reports to you is not, in my opinion, going to give the Congress and the public any greater knowledge or understanding or opportunity to control it.

STATE DEPARTMENT REFUSAL OF BERLIN TROOP FIGURES TO GAO

The CHAIRMAN. How do we know it? This is just the point. You refused to allow the GAO to see whether they are paying it or not. We cannot take your word on faith always, because we have been deceived too often. I think, occasionally, you should allow our people to have access to the facts. I do not think it is acceptable that if the Germans do not pay it we have to pay it eventually. Somebody has to pay for those troops. This matter does not involve only this committee. There are at least 36 Members of the Senate who think we spend too much for the other forces, too.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, Mr. Chairman, all I can say at this point is that I hope we would be able to communicate with you shortly further on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. I have no doubt you will send another letter saying for other reasons you won't make the figures available. That is what you usually do. I do not deny you are reconsidering it, but I do not like it. It casts a grave question about any new operation with which you could do the same thing.

VOA BUDGET AND SIMILARITY OF OPERATIONS

Mr. Hillenbrand, how much is the Voice of America budget? Could you give us those figures?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I think I can get them for you.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is relevant to this because is not the Voice of America doing very much the same thing as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. While I try to produce the figures I will answer the second portion of your question first, if I may, Mr. Chairman. Actually, the answer is "No," because of the legislative authority which provides for VOA operations. The VOA is essentially committed to providing information about the United States, its people and the policies of the U.S. Government. It does not purport to deal with what is happening in third countries, except to the degree that this is merely a question of the news ticker.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not purport to give news?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Yes; but it does not have the facilities or the purpose to try to find out the details about what is happening in third countries, countries of Eastern Europe in this case, and to broadcast these details. For one thing, it does not have the extensive foreign language facilities. Its foreign language broadcasts in the course of a week to some of the countries in Eastern Europe are hardly equal to one day's broadcasting of Radio Free Europe. The two operations are completely disparate in nature.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't we have a transmitter in the Mediterranean that can reach all of Eastern Europe, including Russia, under the direction of VOA?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. We have the transmitting capacity.

The CHAIRMAN. I will give you the figures. In 1971, the Voice of America budget estimate is \$41,459,000; in 1970, it was \$39,980,000; in 1969, it was \$36,494,000; in 1968, it was \$33,612,000; in 1967, it was \$31,977,000. The 1970 figure is approximately what you are asking

now for the continuation of Radio Free Europe and RL and any other.

Actually, this bill is open-ended. You can finance anybody who wished to use these facilities if you saw fit.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. If Congress saw fit.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Board which you create saw fit, really; that is, in the operations of it.

This is about the same amount. I cannot see anything this organization could do that VOA cannot do. VOA has the transmitters already. I think on the Island of Rhodes, or nearby, it has the transmitters which will reach all of this area. The VOA, actually, can reach pretty nearly every place in the world; can it not?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, it can reach those areas to which it is interested in broadcasting.

The CHAIRMAN. It has the capacity to do it if it wishes.

#### U.S. GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION TO NET

You made a comparison with the National Education Television or maybe Mr. Reid did. Do you know how much the Government contributes to the upkeep of the NET?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Upkeep of what?

The CHAIRMAN. It is our domestic public broadcasting. We usually call it the NET. Have you ever heard it called the NET?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. No, I have not heard the term NET. The Educational Network; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Channel 26, yes; I have. I would have to get those figures for you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. They are substantially less than you are asking for this, I believe.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I think that is probably correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Very substantially less. I think the budget estimate for fiscal year 1972 is about \$31 million. It has not been nearly that large.

#### PRIVATE CHARACTER OF RFE AND RL DENIED

Several times in your statement you emphasized the private nature of RFE and RL; did you not? You want to preserve the private character. In your statement, you say you wish to emphasize the importance of the radios' preservation of their private character. How can you say that? Do you consider that the RFE and the RL are private in character?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. They are private corporations which have been incorporated in States of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. I know the corporation is, but is the operation private? Who directs the operation policy of RFE and RL?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, there is a board of directors who sit in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Who appoints them?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Made up to some degree of very distinguished Americans, such as General Clay and so on, who have——

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anybody from the CIA connected with the direction of the operation of the RFE?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to give you that information in executive session.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think it is acceptable in anything else. The Senator from New Jersey, in introducing this bill, said it has been pretended that it was private all of these years and everybody knows it is not. It has been common knowledge that it is not, and now you insist that it is private. You tell us you will give it to us in executive session. I do not understand this, and I do not think it is acceptable that you continue to say this is private when it is common knowledge it is not private.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, of course, one of the essential purposes of the new legislation is to put the whole operation on a new basis.

The CHAIRMAN. But it won't be private. I don't know why you keep emphasizing private. How can it be private when it is to be entirely financed with Government funds?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, we have the analogy of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, which likewise—

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know anybody who is going around and insisting that the NET is private. It is public knowledge that it is not and we all admit it and we appropriate money for it. Nobody pretends it is supported by private means. But the RFE has been a deception to the American public all along. Your ads used to always carry the idea this was a private operation.

For many years, no one could know that the CIA was paying for it and directing it. I consider that it was a deception. It was part of the pattern of deception of the people. Innocent people made contributions to it, thinking it was a private operation. But I think it is high time that it be made public.

If we are to understand how this operation is going to be made and carried on, I think we have to understand how financing that would be carried on. If this is going to continue to pretend to be private when, actually, it was not private, it is just the continuation of a deception.

#### FUTURE PUBLIC NATURE OF RFE AND RL DOUBTED

I told Senator Case originally that I supported strongly his idea that if these stations are to be continued they ought be a part of the annual appropriations. That is out in the open and it is public. But now you come up with a very interesting device for concealing the matter once again. You probably will conceal it and say it is for executive session only. We are going to pretend this is under private direction.

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt?

The CHAIRMAN. It will not be. I do not like the turn this has taken. I would support simply putting a line item in an appropriation bill and fighting it out. Are we willing to continue to proliferate the propaganda agencies on which we spend many millions of dollars, a great deal more money than we will spend on the legitimate information, educational—I mean radio domestically. I think it has taken a turn which I did not anticipate.

This device of a board which you appoint and which reports to you is not, in my opinion, going to give the Congress and the public any greater knowledge or understanding or opportunity to control it.

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, may I make a statement here just to clarify my own position, since the chairman has raised a question of a possible divergence which I do not think we need to have?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, I yield.

Senator CASE. As the chairman said at the outset, I was deeply concerned that the Government should no longer continue in a covert operation.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. That is what you said.

Senator CASE. And I still maintain that.

The CHAIRMAN. I think this device which they have come up with is simply creating an agency in which this is possible.

Senator CASE. Now, the Government is not going to be engaged in a covert operation because we will be spending the money openly for these two radios.

The question arises then of their day-to-day operation and here I think it is desirable to eliminate as far as possible the direction and selection of news from the control of the operating arm of the Government of the United States, the State Department, the CIA, or from the President, himself. This is why I have felt that the effort made with the American Council as a Government supported but independently operated agency was desirable.

But the Congress has the right to know how the money should be spent and I would be one of the first to insist on this. One of my objectives in my questioning earlier was to assure that the annual authorization of this money be in the hands of the Foreign Relations Committee, so we could see that it was being well spent.

#### FUTURE POLICY SUPERVISION OF RADIOS

The CHAIRMAN. In the State Department's background statement

The CHAIRMAN. It will not be. I do not like the turn this has taken. That they supplied us, they make this statement on. This is the official State Department statement which says:

While the Corporation would be private and not a federal agency, there would be sufficient provision for policy supervision to assure that the radios will continue to work in directions compatible with U.S. foreign policy interests.

In other words, everything will have to be cleared by the State Department and those who wish to preserve the cold war atmosphere could, of course, insist that this be done.

Senator CASE. I would be happy for the chairman to develop this point because I am unhappy about that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. That is their own statement about it and I do not think there is any doubt about it.

What has happened is that these radios have become so objectionable to the Germans and others that they were faced themselves by the necessity for doing something.

The Senator, I thought, very properly said that one way to deal with it is to make it a part of the annual appropriations and we will have an opportunity to stop this since it is beginning to appear to be contrary to the President's own policy of trying to reconcile and to relax tensions in Russia and Eastern Europe. That is his announced policy. But this gives them a device which enables them to continue the policies which many of them are very reluctant to give up because they have followed these policies for 20 years.

It is the same as the reluctance to decrease the troops; the reluctance to do anything. But they were faced with the need, probably, of discontinuance, and this looks to me as if it is a device which will try to insure their continuance by pretending these stations are private when, in fact, they are not private because they will be wholly financed by the Government.

PAST CIA SUPPORT FOR RFE AND RL

If you won't give the figures in dollars, Mr. Hillenbrand, will you give the percentage? Did the CIA support these operations during the past years by as much as 90 percent of the costs?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, Mr. Chairman, I really would prefer to discuss the history in an executive session.

The CHAIRMAN. I know you would prefer it, but I do not prefer it. This whole effort of the Senator was to put this out in the open. Now you insist upon secrecy. What is the matter with that?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. We can discuss anything about the future right here and now, and I am prepared to do that, but there are certain sensitivities about what has happened in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. Everybody else knows it. The Germans know it and the Russians know it. The only ones you are trying to fool are this committee because you think it might be prejudicial to this bill, I presume.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. You can have all of the information, Mr. Chairman, in an executive session.

The CHAIRMAN. The public ought to know it; the taxpayers ought to occasionally know what their money is being spent for. I do not think that is acceptable. This has nothing to do with the so-called intelligence-gathering and so on. This is an operation which is on the public airways. Everybody knows what they say and if we are going to be asked to continue this at a \$40 million level, which is the estimated amount they have been spending on it, I think we ought to have the dollars and certainly the percentage of CIA contributions to these operations.

Certainly, no one could doubt that the CIA is paying for it; that they supervise what it does. Neither the CIA nor any other agency is going to put out the money like this and allow some unknown or private individual to determine a policy. You would not expect us to believe that; would you?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Of course, we are moving on to a new system now.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think it is a new system. It just has a new cover. You have decided you need a new cover because the old cover has run its course and you are going to give it a new cover that you hope will allow you to get through the next few years before that becomes so objectionable it has to be removed. But if you are not going to give us the figures, then I personally am not going to support a program, parts of which you insist on keeping secret when the whole thrust of the Senator from New Jersey, I thought, was to make it public and to quit deceiving our own people and Congress. That is what I thought he was looking for and that is why I applauded it in the beginning.

I feel the same way about the payment of our troops in Germany.

I do not think this is a matter for secrecy any longer. It is the same with respect to RIAS. I would like to know its cost and who pays it.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Mr. Chairman, I could put the estimated figures for fiscal year 1972 in the record, which would give you a good idea of past funding and, as I say, we can provide you any information you wish for your committee in executive session, but I am not at liberty myself today to talk about the past history of these radio stations in an open session.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, as far as I am concerned, I am not willing to give you a device to continue it if you are not willing to tell us what has been going on and what it costs and what good it did.

It certainly has succeeded, I think, to a great extent in keeping alive the animosities which grew up after World War II. It contributed very likely to the fact that there is no more progress than there is in the SALT talks, on Berlin, and other places.

#### WEST GERMAN GOVERNMENT'S VIEW OF RADIO FREE EUROPE

There was a long article in the Washington Post on November 22, 1970, by Mr. John M. Goshko, which I will put in the record, Mr. Reporter. I will read one paragraph. It was on Radio Free Europe and contained the following statement:

There have been persistent hints that Chancellor Willy Brandt, committed to a bold policy of reconciliation with Eastern Europe, has come to regard Radio Free Europe as an impediment to this goal. Rumor says that the Government is weighing the possibility of forcing RFE out of West Germany either by refusing to renew its license or by inducing it to relocate "voluntarily."

They are going to ask them to do it without causing an incident, I suppose.

Are you familiar with that article?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I remember it; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It is essentially accurate?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I think it was not essentially accurate.

The CHAIRMAN. In what respect?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. You notice he is referring to "rumor has it," and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know that Chancellor Brandt did not have this in mind?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. We have not been approached in this sense by the German Government.

The CHAIRMAN. In what sense? Have you been approached in any other sense?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. In the sense of the article by the German Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been approached in any other sense?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Obviously, this matter has been discussed. In the past, for example, every time the East Europeans raised this question then, obviously, there has been some discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the West Germans? Have they never raised the matter with you?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. No; I would not be able to say that. All I can say is they never raised it, objecting in any definitive sense as this article implies to the presence and continuation of these stations. In effect,

they have licensed them and they continue to operate under German license.

The CHAIRMAN. We know they have. You never have had any indication from the West German Government that they would like these to be discontinued?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Let us put it this way, Mr. Chairman, we have had discussions about certain problems that these stations, by their presence, have raised. But there have been no requests to terminate them.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they ever indicated they would like to discontinue the operation?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Not in that sense, no.

The CHAIRMAN. In what sense?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. In no sense.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think you ought to play semantic games with us. Just go on and say yes or no. Have they said they like the operation and would like it continued?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. They accept the desirability of the continuation of these stations.

The CHAIRMAN. Since we are paying so much of their defense goal, we have such a lever on them in a bargaining process, I can see how you can persuade them to leave it there.

Have they ever indicated they would like you to consider removing or stopping the operation in any sense?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, let us put it this way.

The CHAIRMAN. Put it any way that is understandable.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. We have had discussions at what is known as the working level about whether there were other alternatives.

HAS WEST GERMANY EVER INDICATED THEY WANT RFE DISCONTINUED?

The CHAIRMAN. I know that, but have they ever indicated they would like this to be discontinued?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. They have never formally indicated it.

The CHAIRMAN. I know they have never done it formally. They would not want to be too brusque because we might cut off some of our enormous payments for their defense. I can understand that. It is a small matter compared to the billions of dollars we pay for their defense bill. I want to know if they have ever indicated that they would like these to be discontinued, and then you talked them out of it? Have you ever indicated that they would like it discontinued?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. That is not the way the discussion has gone. They have said, "We have got some problems here because we are being attacked."

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. "Let's see if we can't work these problems out." And we have been able to work these problems out.

The CHAIRMAN. I know you can work it out. You have a tremendous leverage on them. I can understand that. They cannot raise too much fuss about it because it is a small matter compared to the billions of dollars we are paying for their defense. That is common sense.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, they make—

The CHAIRMAN. You can horse trade them out of it. But have they ever indicated they would like you to take them out?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, as I have said, they have said the presence of these stations presents certain problems. We have sat down with them, and it has not been by threat or by implied withdrawal of American forces or anything else that they have come to the conclusion that this is something they can live with because of the positive benefits to our mutual advantage that these stations present.

The CHAIRMAN. I can understand how you can talk them out of it, but have they indicated that they would prefer you to stop it, and then you have made it plain that you are not going to?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. They have not used that language. That is not—

The CHAIRMAN. No, they spoke in German, I am sure. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILLENBRAND. The meaning of what they said in German was not as you put it.

(The article referred to follows:)

[The Washington Post, Nov. 22, 1970]

RFE ALTERS SULLIED IMAGE

(By John M. Goshko)

Munich—The long, white building has about it the antiseptic look of a hospital. Its setting beside the greenery of Munich's English Gardens gives the impression of institutional remoteness from the outside world. This is the headquarters of Radio Free Europe, recently described by a West German news magazine as "one of the last fortresses of the Cold War."

Its offices, newsrooms and broadcasting studios hum with the activity of some 1,000 men and women who speak in a Babel of languages but with one purpose; to penetrate the Iron Curtain with the "truth" as perceived by the Western world.

For 20 years, this activity has made RFE the object of controversy on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Now this controversy is rubbing against the veil of anonymity that RFE likes to wrap around its operations.

There have been persistent hints that Chancellor Willy Brandt, committed to a bold policy of reconciliation with Eastern Europe, has come to regard Radio Free Europe as an impediment to this goal. Rumor says that the government is weighing the possibility of forcing RFE out of West Germany either by refusing to renew its license or by inducing it to relocate "voluntarily."

These reports have been denied officially by everyone concerned but they are still stirring debate about the future of Radio Free Europe.

ELEMENT OF MYSTERY

Is it an anachronism in a Europe that seems to be moving away from the ideological confrontations of the Cold War toward a new era of detente? Or is it something that people on "the other side" will need more than ever to help them understand the changes sweeping the continent?

The answer is complicated both by the aura of myth and mystery surrounding RFE's operations and by the fact that it has not enjoyed the most favorable image on its own side. Most reasonably informed Americans and West Europeans are aware of RFE's existence, but few know what it actually is or does.

Many tend to confuse it with the Voice of America, the broadcasting arm of the U.S. Information Agency. Yet, while sponsored and directed by Americans, RFE is officially a private, nonprofit organization that denies any links with the U.S. Government.

Similarly, many people think that RFE is in the business of beaming propaganda to the Soviet Union. This is usually the result of confusion with Radio Liberty, an American-sponsored, private organization headquartered in Munich, which does broadcast to Russia. But while the Brandt government reportedly

would like to have Radio Liberty out of West Germany, the two facilities are entirely unconnected.

RFE's concern is not the Soviet Union but Moscow's so-called satellites, and its broadcasts are aimed exclusively at Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria. In fact, RFE is essentially a network of five radio stations, each tailoring its material to the interests of people in one of those countries and broadcasting to them in their native language.

Their daily output—20 hours to Czechoslovakia, 19 hours to Poland and Hungary, 12 hours to Romania and 7½ hours to Bulgaria—exceeds the combined total of all other Western stations broadcasting to those countries. The broadcasts are relayed by 32 transmitters in West Germany and Portugal with a total power of 2,245,000 watts.

RFE's programming is heavily news and political commentary leavened here and there by lighter fare such as pop music programs aimed at East European youth. Its staff of approximately 1500 includes the East European exiles manning the five national departments, a large newsgathering and editing operation, a research arm and administrative and technical personnel.

Although the size of its audience is a matter of some controversy, RFE claims that its broadcasts are heard regularly by some 31 million people—about half of the five countries' population over the age of 14. It cites the sporadic attempts at jamming and the frequent denunciations by the East European governments and press as proof that it has a definite influence on its listeners.

Ralph E. Walter, a 46-year-old Minnesotan who is RFE's director, says: "People wouldn't listen to Western radio like Radio Free Europe unless they knew that there is something on it that they want and can't get through the programs readily available to them in their own countries."

"We have always maintained that RFE's job is to work itself out of business," Walter says. "When and if the time comes that a Pole or a Czech can read and hear a variety of views in his national press, there will no longer be a need for RFE."

#### A LUCIUS CLAY PROJECT

This goal—to give the people of Eastern Europe information and ideas denied them by the controlled press of their own countries—was one that few Westerners could fault when Radio Free Europe began broadcasting July 4, 1950, at the height of the Cold War.

Its founding spirit and perennial board chairman was Gen. Lucius D. Clay, the postwar U.S. military commander in Germany and a hero of the Berlin blockade. Serving with him over the years on the board of Free Europe, Inc., RFE's New York-based corporate parent, has been a Who's Who of the Wall Street and public service establishments. The current president and chief operating officer, for example, is William P. Durkee, who was director of the Office of Emergency Planning under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

In those early days, there was always an impressive bipartisan array of public figures to lend their names to RFE's fund-raising appeals. The public became accustomed to ads portraying RFE transmitters piercing barbed wire to reach Eastern Europeans hungry for word from the West. Like the Red Cross or the Community Fund, Radio Free Europe was regarded as a worthy cause.

Then came the Hungarian uprising of 1956, and RFE suddenly stood accused of leading thousands to death or imprisonment by helping to incite the revolt through inflammatory propaganda and then raising false hopes that the West would intervene.

Although RFE's role in the Hungarian crisis has been dissected innumerable times, there has been no clear-cut verdict on the degree of its responsibility in that tragedy. Nonetheless, it became suspect in liberal eyes of harboring a fundamental anticommunism out of tune with the shifting subtleties of East-West relations.

#### A CIA TAIN

Three years ago, this picture was reinforced by revelations that RFE had ties to the Central Intelligence Agency and was the recipient of substantial CIA subsidies. Liberals now saw it as an organization dominated by embittered exiles whose dreams of turning back the clock of Eastern European history were being manipulated by the CIA to perpetuate the Cold War. And when Brandt's Eastern policy emerged a year ago, it was not surprising that many of its supporters should regard RFE as a potential threat to détente.

Such suspicion is certainly understandable in view of RFE's frequent heavy-handedness and lack of candor, but it overlooks the fact that the organization's past reputation for hardline anticommunism is no longer valid.

This does not mean that its basic goals have changed or that it is any more palatable to the East European regimes, which continue to denounce RFE as a "fascist" and "revanchist" troublemaker. But, to a degree that has not yet been fully grasped by its critics in the West, RFE has become increasingly sensitive to the changes affecting Europe and more sophisticated in applying this sensitivity to its programming.

Emery Keeri-Santo, a Hungarian who heads RFE's audience research activities, explains the change this way: "The difference between the old and the new Radio Free Europe is the same as the difference between how the world, including the United States, regarded East-West relations in 1950 and in 1970.

"When RFE first began, we looked on it as a five-year job. By then, we thought, the Iron Curtain would have been rolled back, and our broadcasts reflected this belief. We were wrong, and eventually we had to make the agonizing reappraisal that meant recognizing and accommodating to the longer view.

"Now, I think, our broadcasting no longer reflects a senseless and unbelievable appeal for the overthrow of communism. Our aim now is to assist the efforts of East Europeans to win through the process of natural, peaceful change a larger measure of personal freedom and national independence."

This assessment of RFE is shared by a surprisingly large number of Western diplomats and journalists who deal closely with East European affairs. In their view, RFE is not an obstacle to detente but a device to further it by making clear to Eastern Europeans the West's point of view in the complex maneuvers set in motion by Brandt's Eastern policy.

Ralph Walter sums it up like this: "We're completely behind the idea of detente—provided it's the genuine article. To us, detente doesn't mean a mere freezing of the status quo so that the Communist governments will have a free hand within their respective domains.

"We regard detente as opening the prospect for better understanding and more stable relations between East and West. That means give and take on both sides, including a greater flow of contracts and ideas. And as the game unfolds, there has to be a means of making clear to the people of Eastern Europe the benefits that this could mean to them personally so that they won't let their leaders misrepresent and short-change them."

Many, however, still question whether RFE can fill the role described by Walter. How much credibility, the critics ask, can East Europeans be expected to grant to the organization that is now recognized as heavily dependent on the CIA for its operating funds?

The question is a tough one, and RFE's officers have not only been notably candid about answering it. At the lower levels, most RFE personnel take refuge in saying that they don't know where the money comes from—in some cases adding that they don't "want to know." And when one goes to the top, questions about the CIA are met with silence.

#### NO MORE FUND-RAISING

The old public appeals for funds have all but disappeared. Recently, two plaques outside the main entrance of the Munich headquarters that told in English and German about RFE's work being made possible by "the contributions of the American people" were quietly removed.

When asked what RFE does for money now, its top people emphasize "corporate contributions." But while it has received substantial donations from such sources as U.S. Steel, this obviously is only a part of the truth.

From the available facts, there seems no doubt that the CIA played a big role in creating Radio Free Europe and continues to be its principal bankroller. However, it also appears true that the CIA does not control RFE or even influence its policies.

Instead, the relationship seems to be based on the idea that the CIA regards RFE's work as beneficial to U.S. policy aims and is therefore willing to underwrite it because RFE could not continue without such subsidies. (A similar kind of financial relationship also appears to exist with Radio Liberty.)

Those who work for RFE insist without exception that they have never seen any pressure to follow a "government line" or to soften news of commandary that might be at variance with U.S. policies or interest. Nor are these disclaimers

as disingenuous or self-serving as they might seem to a skeptical outsider. To go inside Radio Free Europe and observe its workings at first hand is to discover a remarkable degree of independence and respect for conflicting opinions.

Nowhere is this spirit so evident as in the news department, which likes to describe itself as a "news agency" that draws on its own correspondents and other sources to produce a comprehensive, round-the-clock report of world happenings.

The news director is Nathan Kingsley, a jovial New Yorker who spent several years on the now-defunct New York Herald Tribune, including service as its national editor and managing editor of its Paris edition. His staff of Munich-based editors and field correspondents are mostly Americans or "Commonwealth types" from Britain, Canada and Australia.

The newsroom atmosphere is professional. Those who work there represent a wide variety of political views, but all are experienced newsmen who seem to have joined RFE not out of any special desire to fight the Cold War but because they like living and working in Europe.

In an apparent effort to live down RFE's old 1950's-era reputation for unreliability, the news department stresses objectivity to the point where Kingsley concedes that it is "overly bland and even sterile by Western standards."

No fact is reported unless it can be attributed to a specific source, and in most cases, no story is used on the air unless it has been cross-checked with another source. So complete is the separation of news from opinion that all material for news broadcasts is put on white paper as a sign to the broadcasting departments that it cannot be used for commentary. (Material deemed suitable for commentary or analysis is put on buff-colored paper.)

Kingsley maintains that there is no special way of handling stories that might be regarded as harmful to the image of the United States or its European allies: "The rule is that if it's news, if it's of potential interest to our listeners, and if it's accurate, it goes on the air."

The only exception to this, he says, is news of "a potentially provocative nature—a report of a riot or a political trial or some other development that could excite passions and cause violence or other trouble."

The importance of this caution was demonstrated during the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, when thousands of Czechs are known to have tuned in RFE for news of what was happening. In contrast to Hungary in 1956, diplomats and foreign reporters on the scene in Prague unanimously praised RFE's coverage for its restraint.

Similarly, later in 1968 when there were rumors of Soviet troops massing for a possible invasion of Romania, RFE refused to put the story on the air—a caution not observed by scores of American and West European newspapers and radio stations that later were forced to retract.

A similar objective detachment is found in the research and analysis department, headed by James F. Brown, a boyish-looking Englishman who started out as a teacher of art history. The department employs some 80 analysts to monitor and study developments behind the Iron Curtain. Although their work is intended primarily for the assistance of the broadcasting departments, they have achieved such a reputation that their work is read by scholars, government officials and journalists all over the world.

In the early 1960s, for example, when Hungarian leader Janos Kadar was still being dismissed by most Eastern Europe watchers as a puppet of Moscow, RFE analysts were among the first to recognize that he was moving Hungary into economic paths that would win him strong popular backing at home and a measure of autonomy within the Communist bloc.

In recent weeks, RFE has played a similar trail-blazing role in interpreting the position of Gustav Husak, the Czech Communist Party leader. In contrast to the widely held view that he was an interim figure who would gradually be swept aside by hard-line Stalinist elements, RFE researchers have argued that Husak was gradually consolidating his power in the same manner as Kadar—a view that is beginning to gain considerable currency among other students of Eastern Europe.

#### THE EXILES

Finally, there are RFE's national broadcasting departments, manned by Eastern Europeans who have chosen the life of an exile, who know that they can never go home again. Typical of them all is the Polish broadcasting service, whose key personnel are mostly middle-aged men who left their homeland either during the Nazi occupation or the postwar Communist takeover. All are well-educated, intel-

lectually intense in the Eastern European manner and have backgrounds as journalists, teachers or professional men.

The director, Jan Nowak, began his radio career when he parachuted into Poland during the 1944 Warsaw uprising as a representative of the Polish government in exile and broadcast over the resistance movement's clandestine station. He has been involved in exile activities ever since, joining RFE in 1951.

The activities he oversees include the standard RFE fare of on-the-hour news, youth-oriented rock sessions presided over by hip-talking disc jockeys and minute coverage of the activities of Poles in the West. A few years ago, when Moe Drabowsky, a refugee from a Polish village, turned in a stellar World Series pitching performance for the Baltimore Orioles, RFE filled the air to Poland with enthusiastic if mystifying accounts of his starring role in the exotic American pastime.

But the real core of the Polish broadcasts is the lengthy commentaries on Polish affairs. Analysis of the Polish service's comments on the Bonn-Warsaw negotiations clearly support the view that there is nothing in RFE's broadcasting that could be regarded as detrimental to Brandt's drive for detente. On the contrary, the commentaries by Nowak and his colleagues have been almost unreservedly enthusiastic in their support of the proposed treaty.

#### A DEBATABLE AUDIENCE

Despite RFE's claims to a wide listenership behind the Iron Curtain, no one can tell how big its impact really is. Most impartial observers with long experience in Eastern Europe seem to feel that while RFE doesn't cut quite the swath it thinks it does and has some gaps in its credibility, it is listened to. Some go even further and say that RFE is the principal source of Western information for most East Europeans.

Despite the denials, it is known that the hints about a possible crackdown on RFE and Radio Liberty originated with high-ranking members of the Brandt government. The general supposition is that they were trial balloons intended to determine what reaction would result and to put RFE and Radio Liberty on notice that they might someday become expendable.

Nevertheless, the general feeling in government circles is that Brandt is not contemplating any action against either station in the immediate future. For one thing, Washington is understood to have reacted negatively to the idea and Brandt has no intention of straining his relations with the Nixon administration over a relatively second-level issue like this one.

However, the matter can be expected to come up again. In 1972, for example, Munich will play host to the Olympic Games and some Communist regimes have threatened a boycott if RFE and Radio Liberty are still operating in the city at that time.

For the moment though, as one Bonn government source says, "Brandt has made quite a few concessions to the Communists already. Radio Free Europe is the sort of bargaining chip that he can hold in reserve and throw into the pot later."

#### VOA BROADCASTING ON RADIO MOSCOW'S ASSIGNED LONG WAVE FREQUENCY

The CHAIRMAN. You said a moment ago that there had been no radio jamming by the VOA; did you not?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I said the U.S. Government does not jam foreign radio broadcasts to the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you consider the Voice of America the U.S. Government or do you distinguish between the Voice of America and the U.S. Government?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. No; I think one can talk of VOA as an arm of the U.S. Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Then are you familiar with an article by Marilyn Berger in the Washington Post of November 16, 1970, the headline of which is, "Radio Moscow Hit by VOA 'Jamming'"? Then it goes on to say: "The Voice of America has resumed prime time broadcasting on Radio Moscow's assigned long-wave frequency in a renewed 'jamming' war." Are you familiar with the article?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I am familiar with the article. I am also familiar with the fact that it is a rather loose usage of the word "jamming" to apply that term to this particular situation because the VOA was not jamming in the technical sense. They were merely broadcasting a perfectly intelligible program on the same wavelength.

The CHAIRMAN. On the same [laughter]. I will please ask the audience to refrain no matter how funny this sounds to you, because it interrupts my train of thought. It is very easy to do and Mr. Hillenbrand knows that. He can do it too.

The article goes on and makes this point:

The frequency—173—was allocated to Radio Moscow by the 1948 Copenhagen Convention but the VOA used it up to 1963, when the Soviets stopped jamming.

I will put the entire article in the record. The last part of it says:

VOA officials generally deny any jamming activities per se. The argument has been made that since Germany was not a party to the Copenhagen Convention, VOA could use that frequency in transmitting from Germany.

Independent radio experts feel, however, that unauthorized use of an assigned frequency disrupts the worldwide allocation system.

Are you saying this article is also inaccurate?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, I think the article itself presented the argument. This was not technically jamming which is the position of the VOA in the matter.

Now, this is not a responsibility, I might say, of the Department of State.

(The article referred to follows:)

[The Washington Post, Nov. 16, 1970]

#### RADIO MOSCOW HIT BY VOA "JAMMING"

(By Marilyn Berger)

The Voice of America has resumed prime-time broadcasting on Radio Moscow's assigned long-wave frequency in a renewed "jamming" war.

The use of the frequency of 173 kilohertz interferes with Radio Moscow's signals to Eastern Europe, but United States Information Agency officials said it is primarily designed to make up for Soviet jamming of other VOA frequencies.

VOA officials said the programs, in Russian and English, can reduce Radio Moscow's audience outside the Soviet Union. But more important, USIA officials said, they make it possible for American broadcasts to reach large audiences in Eastern Europe, particularly Soviet troops stationed abroad.

Both objectives appeared to be behind the use of frequency 173 from a one-million-watt transmitter in Bavaria.

The frequency was allocated to Radio Moscow by the 1948 Copenhagen Convention but the VOA used it up to 1963, when the Soviets stopped jamming. USIA officials said the United States resumed using the frequency Aug. 21, 1969, one year to the day after the Soviet Union resumed jamming the Voice of America at the time the Soviets invaded Czechoslovakia.

The decision to resume use of frequency 173 after a more than five-year hiatus was made under Frank Shakespeare, head of the USIA, the VOA's parent agency.

On Saturday, Pravda accused Shakespeare, who has won a reputation for his hard-line views on the Soviet Union, of spreading anti-Soviet propaganda.

USIA officials, however, said the decision to use frequency 173 was an institutional one and not attributable to Shakespeare's personal views.

A career USIA official said the United States clearly told the Soviet Union that it will stop using 173 when the Russians stop jamming. About a month ago, the USIA official said, there was an exchange of letters in which the United States proposed talks and offered specifically to turn off 173 if the Russians ceased jamming. The official said the Russians sent back a brusque note in which

they declared jamming to be an internal Soviet matter but that they would expect the United States to stop using frequency 173.

Although the Russians consider the use of 173 as an American jamming device, at least some informed sources here call the charge unfounded. These sources say Radio Moscow uses the frequency primarily for domestic Russian programming and that the VOA broadcasts reach only into border areas of the Soviet Union, particularly the Ukraine. Interference with the Russian signal, these sources said, occurs mostly outside the Soviet Union, especially in central Poland.

This means that in some areas of Eastern Europe, listeners who would normally receive Radio Moscow no longer can. VOA officials concede that their broadcasts on 173 do not reach many Russians within the Soviet Union.

Independent radio experts do not hesitate to call the U.S. use of 173 a jamming operation. They say that although both Radio Moscow and the VOA would be received clearly in their immediate so-called "A" areas, it is impossible to put two signals on one frequency intentionally without jamming.

Informed sources said the VOA uses frequency 173 for prime-time broadcasts a total of six hours a day, two in Russian and four in English. The powerful one-million-watt transmitter with an omnidirectional antenna, informed sources said, could reach from the Urals to Ireland and as far south as North Africa if it were not in competition with Radio Moscow's 500-kilowatt transmitter.

Informed sources said it was hoped at first that the Russian resumption of jamming in 1968 was only a temporary device to keep news of events in Czechoslovakia out of the Soviet Union. In time, however, these sources said, the Russians stepped up their activities to pre-1963 levels. Voice officials concluded that they should use whatever means were available to them—including 173—to reach Eastern Europe.

Besides using the 173 transmitter, VOA has increased the number of short-wave transmissions to penetrate Soviet jamming.

VOA officials generally deny any jamming activities, per se. The argument has been made that since Germany was not a party to the Copenhagen convention, VOA could use that frequency in transmitting from Germany.

Independent radio experts feel, however, that unauthorized use of an assigned frequency disrupts the worldwide allocation system.

(The following information was subsequently supplied.)

#### VOA 173 KC TRANSMITTER

(Submitted by Department of State)

During the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 24, the Chairman referred to a Washington Post article about a VOA transmitter based in Munich which allegedly is jamming Soviet broadcasts. Subsequently one of the witnesses, Mr. Bartlett, criticized this facility at length charging that its activities were even more immoral than Soviet jamming of the Voice of America, because the Munich transmitter interferes with Radio Moscow broadcasts to the Russian people, whereas Soviet jamming of VOA, deplorable as it is, is designed to block foreign broadcasts to the peoples of the Soviet Union.

The 173 KC transmitter operating out of Munich has side effects on Radio Moscow broadcasts to Eastern Europe, not over thousands of miles of Russian territory as Bartlett claimed. Here are the facts on the 173 KC transmitter. It was first put on the air in 1953 to overcome jamming in Eastern Europe and enable VOA to reach the peoples of Eastern Europe. It interferes with Soviet broadcasts to those same peoples on that frequency, but does not, of course, affect the numerous other frequencies used by the Soviets to reach that same audience. In legal terms, while the Copenhagen Convention assigned this frequency to the USSR, that Convention does not apply to Germany nor is the US itself a member thereof. Nonetheless, the United States has stood ready from the beginning to terminate broadcasts from this facility as soon as the Soviets cease their practice of jamming international foreign broadcasts to the USSR which is a clear violation of the principles of international broadcasting. In fact, in 1962 when the Soviet Union ceased jamming VOA, the Munich transmitter was silenced. In 1968 massive jamming by the USSR was revived simultaneously with the invasion of Czechoslovakia. The United States, after a year of futile diplomatic

efforts to persuade the Soviets to once again cease jamming VOA, reluctantly reactivated the Munich transmitter. The United States has clearly stated to the Soviets our willingness to cease the VOA broadcasts on this frequency as soon as the Soviets are ready to abandon the jamming of VOA. The Soviets have rebuffed each diplomatic initiative to this end and refused to even discuss the question.

Thus while VOA interference with Radio Moscow is not illegal, the United States is ready to cease broadcasting on 173 KC frequency at a moment's notice as part of a US-Soviet effort to expand rather than prevent free flow of information between the American and Soviet peoples. Meanwhile the station reaches hundreds of thousands of listeners in the Russian language (including Soviet Armed Forces) who are stationed in Eastern Europe and East Germany, and Eastern Europeans in the English language. Thereby it partially compensates for the effects of Soviet jamming of VOA and other Western broadcasts.

#### TECHNICAL JAMMING AND BROADCASTING ON SAME WAVELENGTH

The CHAIRMAN. How would you describe technical jamming? What is technical jamming?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I think technical jamming is to utilize various noise devices and so on which completely make unintelligible the live broadcasts which are beamed to a certain area. Anyone who has lived in Eastern Europe would quickly recognize jamming and be able to distinguish it from a coverage of the same wave band, a technique, I might say, which is not unique to this particular case.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any practical difference between making unintelligible noises and broadcasting on the same wavelength? Does that not interrupt and prevent the intelligible reception of the other broadcasts on the same wavelength?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Partly that would depend, I think, from my own experience, on the sensitivity of the receiver.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought the essence of jamming is to broadcast on the same wavelength. If they made these funny noises on some other wavelength, it would not jam; would it? It has to be on the same wavelength in order to interfere.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. They cover a whole portion of the band, because there are various ways of jamming.

#### DEFINITION OF PRIVATE AGENCY

The CHAIRMAN. I do not remember. What did you finally say about calling this new agency a private agency if it is funded by the Government? What is your definition of private?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, I think the definition of private is essentially an organization which regardless of the source of its funds, is autonomous and has a board of directors that runs the organization, who are appointed by a process which does not make them beholden on a day-to-day basis to the U.S. Government for instructions. This is the way the radios will operate under this new legislation.

#### COMMON UNDERSTANDING OF "PRIVATE CORPORATION"

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think the common understanding of the word "private" corporation or organization is one which may be funded by Government funds? Is that the way ordinary people interpret the words, "a private corporation"?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, I think, technically speaking, the whole idea when the Public Broadcasting Corporation was set up, provided a prototype for some of the language in this bill. It was conceived to be a private, essentially a private operation.

Now, the term public-private could be used, I suppose, to describe the interlocking relationship of Government and the operation, but in the way we conceived this operation actually taking place, we would not be interfering on a day-to-day basis with the technical or practical operation of these radios.

The CHAIRMAN. Take the NET. That is operated under what is called the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. It is not the Private Broadcasting Act of 1967. Don't you think, outside of the State Department, that when you use the word "private," people usually think it is privately financed and privately owned? A private corporation is usually one that is not owned by the Government. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was a good example. It was never called a private organization or a private corporation. I think it is deceptive to continue to insist that this is a private operation when it actually will be financed wholly by Government funds. If it is to be done that way, we are trying to get the record straight.

EFFECT OF CONTINUING BROADCASTS ON UNITED STATES-RUSSIAN  
RELATIONS

Tell me, Mr. Hillenbrand, do you think the continuation of these broadcasts promotes the lessening of animosity between the Russians and ourselves? Would it promote the relaxation of tensions? What would you think would be the effect of continuing them?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I do not think the continuance will be a major factor influencing the basic negotiation of those issues which are up for discussion between us at the present time.

I think these broadcasting facilities and the reputation which they have created for themselves are a definite asset for the United States. There are assets on the other side which are much more active and spend a great deal more money for similar activities than we do, and it seems to me during a transitional period, such as the present, it would be rather foolhardy unilaterally to simply waste our assets and not continue them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this a chip which we have to play in the negotiations and something we want to retain in order to give up in case there are negotiations?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. No, I do not think this is something you would negotiate about. This is something which creates, I think, the possibility of achieving negotiations over time because it does have a highly educative function.

EFFECT OF PAST BROADCASTS ON UNITED STATES-RUSSIAN RELATIONS

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think it has tended to improve our relations with Russia in the past?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. It would be hard to say that it has made them any worse. I think to the degree it has had an educative effect on Soviet people, and to the degree that these people have been able to influence policy at all, then I think this has had a positive effect.

The CHAIRMAN. If it has been good for the Russians, why have they spent six times as much as Radio Liberty's annual budget to jam the broadcasts?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, obviously, the judgment of what is good for the Russians need not necessarily be shared by the Soviet Government; and this is, I think, one of the differences between an open society and a closed society which should not have to be explained.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think we have the same attitude toward Russia that the Chinese have toward us, that our own enemy is the Government of Russia, but we are very friendly with the people of Russia? Is that our policy?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. No; I do not think anyone would fall for that rather oversimplified explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the difference between that and what you said about the Russians and their government?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, I thought I had made my answer a little more clear, with a little more nuance than the description you gave of it.

What I said was, there is a sophisticated audience in the Soviet Union which is capable by obtaining facts about conditions in the Soviet Union, which come from no other source, and which are unobtainable from the Soviet press or Soviet radio, perhaps, to have a certain positive effect upon the general course of Soviet policy. This is true of all of the other Eastern European countries.

The fact is that when such a sizable percentage of the public listens to those broadcasts, it is bound to have a certain catalytic effect upon thinking in these countries. Obviously, these are things you cannot measure with mathematical precision.

#### RADIO MOSCOW'S BROADCASTS TO THE UNITED STATES

The CHAIRMAN. You mentioned a moment ago that Radio Moscow broadcasts in a similar manner to this country; did you not? What program was it that you mentioned?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. "Radio Peace and Progress."

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a Russian program?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Those are foreign language programs.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they beamed to America?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Beamed to the Western World; I mean they actually have—

The CHAIRMAN. I only asked about America. Are they beamed to the United States?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Yes, Radio Moscow broadcasts are beamed to the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever known anyone outside of the Government who has ever listened to them?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. No.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I have not, no.

The CHAIRMAN. I have never heard it mentioned in our press. I do not recall ever having heard of a man or a woman, and I do not think I have never received a letter, saying, "We heard Radio Moscow yesterday, and they told us the truth about the CIA operations in Laos."

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I think that is a tribute to the sophistication of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean because they do not listen to it?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Or that they do not feel they need to listen. I think they realize their own public media provide them with all the information they require.

The CHAIRMAN. You know that is strange because this committee, at least the chairman of it, believes that the Government does not supply us with half the information that we need and to which we are entitled. We are not as sophisticated as the public. I do not think we receive the information to which we are entitled. I have never really quite forgotten the famous statement attributed to one of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense that the Government has a right to lie. Do you remember that?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I remember it, but I did not make it.

The CHAIRMAN. No, you did not make it.

#### RFE COVERAGE OF RIOTS IN POLAND

Mr. Hillenbrand, Poland is one of the five countries to which RFE broadcasts. Do you know how it covered the riots that took place in that country last year?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I think it covered them in a very sober and responsible way; it provided information about them, but it did not incite to riot.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think the broadcasts covered only the factual situation?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I think that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. Did it editorialize about the situation in Poland?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, it provided commentary, but I do not believe the commentary was in any sense inciting. If you wish, we could provide you with a detailed analysis of the broadcasting to Poland during this period.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that would be interesting. Could you supply that for the record?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Surely.

(The information referred to follows:)

FREE EUROPE, INC.,  
New York, N.Y., May 28, 1971.

Hon. MARTIN J. HILLENBRAND,  
Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, Department of State,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HILLENBRAND: In response to your request for a report dealing with Radio Free Europe's broadcasts to Poland during the period of the December difficulties in that country, I am forwarding the following:

(1) An extract from a quarterly operational report covering the period from January through March, 1971, which I have submitted to the Chairman of the Board and Directors of the Board of Radio Free Europe; and,

(2) A detailed study of broadcasting to Poland during this period with some reference to broadcasts prior to that period when relevant as background.

I believe that these two documents constitute a fair and definitive statement of our treatment of the events in Poland prior to 14 December 1970 and the period following through March, 1971.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. DURKEE.

Encls: As stated.

## QUARTERLY OPERATIONAL REPORT, JANUARY-MARCH 1971 (EXCERPT)

## RFE BROADCASTING—POLAND

A lengthy and detailed study<sup>1</sup> has been made of RFE broadcasts to Poland before and during the December upheaval and its aftermath. The positions taken by the Polish Broadcasting Department of RFE on current issues in Poland were compared with the known demands of the striking Polish workers during December, January and February, and with the concessions granted by the new Polish leadership since December 20. The results show a striking correlation between Polish popular demands, as revealed in the specific desiderata of the striking workers made public by the Polish press and radio, and in the concessions to both these demands and more general public desires which the new leadership felt obliged to grant in order to restore political stability and economic productivity, and the positions espoused by RFE in its Polish broadcasts.

The area of greatest urgency for both the Polish populace and leadership was the broad one of distribution of the national product. This includes income policy, which in Poland embraces wages, family allowances, and the material incentives, or bonus, a system for workers; the food price increases themselves, which had sparked the December riots; the critical shortage of housing; the problems of women workers; and, of less urgency, the vacation system for workers. Concessions were rapid: wages and family allowances for the lowest-paid were raised in December, and the bonus system altered in January to conform to the most vociferous of the workers' demands; food price increases were rescinded in February, previous inadequate housing plans were scrapped and expanded programs approved in February; the problems of women workers were given high priority in the new leadership's planning; and recent increases in the charges for workers' vacations were rescinded and allocations for travel increased in February. In all these cases the concessions granted corresponded with the measures recommended by RFE before the workers' demands became publicly known.

The next most urgent imperative was for political changes. Dismissals were essential to appease the populace and to reinforce the new leadership's credibility. A first series of dismissals swept the top leadership from the scene: Gomulka himself, Kliszko, Strzelecki, Spychalski, and Jaszczuk, the economic scapegoat, were removed from the Politburo on December 20; Cyrankiewicz was demoted from Premier to Chief of State on December 23; and on February 7, in accord with specific popular demand, Loga-Sowinski and Kociolek left the Politburo. It was then the turn of regional and subordinate authorities: dismissals affecting Party leaders in Szczecin, Gdansk, Elblag, and Lodz appear to have been unitive, one in Cracow precautionary, and those of the Minister of Interior and the Deputy Minister of Defense responsible for the troops used against workers in December clearly deferential to popular feeling. Finally, the eddies swept out to include the leadership of the two minor parties, the United Peasant and the Democratic Parties, who theoretically govern in "coalition" with the ruling Polish United Workers Party.

Still in the sphere of political changes, the new leadership's sharpest reversal was its proclaimed desire for "normalization" of Church-State relations, and the substantive concessions to the Church that followed. RFE's support of the Polish Catholic Church, its broadcasts of Church statements and news when the Polish media ignored them, its advocacy of Church desiderata in any future "normalization," had been consistent and undiminished over the years. RFE had similarly and repeatedly called for a reform of the Polish trade union movement to represent workers' interests, and the restoration to the Workers' Councils of the rights taken from them since 1956 under Gomulka, and these were among the most frequently voiced workers' demands.

No appeasement of Polish popular discontent, as it stood revealed in December, was possible without a redressing of the market. This meant in the first instance an improvement in supplies to the market, notably of meat. The new leadership resorted in January to imports, including meat from the West, and then in March, as part of a new program to reverse the critical decline in Polish meat production, raised procurement prices for meat and reduced feed prices, thereby restoring profitability to animal husbandry. RFE had for several years attributed

<sup>1</sup> Attached Study entitled "The Polish Crisis of 1970-71 and Radio Free Europe Broadcasts—Insight Into a Relationship."

the decline in meat production to its unprofitability for the farmer; the new average procurement price for hogs differed by only 0.05 zlotys per kilogram from that cited by RFE as necessary to restore profitability.

The new leadership's aims for redressing the market apparently looked beyond the short term. In March the Politburo recommended to the Government (in conjunction with the Presidium of the United Peasant Party) the abolition of compulsory deliveries by private farmers of slaughter animals, grain, and potatoes, as of January 1, 1972, and the establishment by the same date of a comprehensive system of social insurance program for private farmers, who constitute 89% of the Polish agricultural labor force. Both measures had long been advocated by RFE. The really essential, long-term step necessary to redressing the Polish market, and more, to overcoming the stagnation that has characterized the Polish economy for some years now, is basic economic reform. RFE, in its vigorous support of economic reform going back to 1956 and before, has pointed out repeatedly that Poland is far behind the rest of the Soviet bloc, the Soviet Union included, in dismantling the Stalinist, command-type economy. The new Party First Secretary has promised far-reaching though unspecified, economic reforms, and domestic advocates of Polish economic reform have been placed in key positions.

In their efforts to gain popular support and to differentiate themselves from their predecessors, the new Polish leadership has emphasized a new style of governing, which at least rhetorically corresponds to some of the demands advanced on behalf of the Polish people by RFE over the years. Gierek himself launched the slogan of a "dialogue" between the leadership and the people in a New Year's Eve address; on various other occasions he has promised "honest and full" information in the media. The latter responds to strong worker demands; the former has been enthusiastically received by the populace. RFE, itself a longtime supporter of both steps, has stressed that a valid "dialogue" must be between Party and Government on the one hand, and the entire nation on the other, and not just between the Party leadership and the Party rank-and-file; it has also pressed at every opportunity for fulfillment of the promise of "honest and full" information on casualties suffered in the coastal disturbances to be a touchstone of the leadership's sincerity in this matter—as did the striking workers themselves. RFE continued to press strongly on this question until figures were finally given by Gierek in an address to the Central Committee on February 7.

RFE had long spoken against Gomulka's repressive cultural policy, and in particular against the persecutions of progressive intellectuals and artists which followed on the disturbances of March, 1968. The new leadership, although moving slowly in this sphere, has taken tentative steps: several writers banned in 1968 are being published again, and there are indications of further steps to restore previously persecuted artists and writers to cultural life. However in the tentative initial steps to free cultural life from its more obvious restraints, Gierek scored one major success with intellectuals on January 20 by authorizing the reconstruction of the Royal Castle of Warsaw, as dear to the hearts of Poles as the Arc de Triomphe to Frenchmen or the Dam to Dutchmen, and a long-standing project, the mere mention of which had been forbidden under Gomulka. From January 15, 1955 to January 17, 1971, RFE had beamed 28 separate programs on this subject to Poland.

In sum, the December events in Poland, and their aftermath, revealed, directly and indirectly, the enduringly democratic nature of the Polish people's fundamental aspirations, so far as they can be expressed and realized within the limitations imposed by Soviet proximity. They also showed how remarkably closely the Polish Broadcasting Department of RFE, in its daily programming to Poland, is in touch with, and how faithfully it reflects, the problems and aspirations of its audience.

Apart from what is revealed by this study, RFE's Audience and Public Opinion Research Department reported in mid-January that its most recent survey showed that a majority of Poles interviewed named RFE coverage of the price increases, the December riots, and the changes within the Party leadership as particularly interesting. This was hardly surprising, in view of the fact that subsequent events indicated how accurately RFE's output on the price increases reflected the feelings of the great majority of the Polish population, that RFE

was the first to break the news of the coastal riots to the rest of Poland (and indeed to the rest of the world, on the basis of a Radio Gdansk broadcast audible in Poland only in the immediate area, and picked up shortly before midnight, December 15, giving RFE a news monopoly which lasted from 2332 hours December 15 to 1600 hours December 16), and that RFE remained thereafter the only continuous source of news for Poles of the unfolding events. By March 15 the surveys showed that among Poles it was still RFE coverage of the changes within the Party leadership, plus RFE reporting on the impact in the East and the West of the Polish events, that were singled out as of particular interest. The Polish authorities, which had ceased jamming RFE broadcasts in 1956, resumed it on March 17, 1971. We do not yet know how effective their jamming is.

RFE's four other Broadcasting Departments of course made extensive use of events in Poland in their programming, in a classic example of RFE's "cross-reporting" technique. As the Bulgarian, Czechoslovak, Hungarian, and Rumanian regimes were all reluctant, in only slightly varying degrees, to provide news of the Polish events (and, in a reverse example of "cross-reporting" of their own, limited their news of the Polish events to that given by the Polish strictly official media only, and, after some relaxation of censorship in Poland, to even less than they provided), RFE's coverage was substantially the only source of news of the Polish developments for the public in the four countries. A measure of appreciation of the importance of this cross-reporting for the other countries was contained in the Audience and Public Opinion Research surveys for this period, showing that in mid-January a plurality of Czechoslovaks, Hungarians, and Rumanians pointed to the coverage of Polish events as particularly interesting, and that in mid-March this was still the case, with a plurality of Bulgarian listeners interviewed having joined in the same estimate.

RFE's cross-reporting on the Polish events and their aftermath consisted of both news and commentary. The news to all four countries was, of course, identical, but the commentary was adapted in each case to the local situation (an emphasis on the trade union component of the Polish developments for Rumania and Bulgaria, on the role played in Poland by the failure to carry through economic reform for Hungary and Czechoslovakia). There were echoes from these countries of the effectiveness of the technique. In late December and early January rumors began circulating in Bulgaria, for example, of imminent price increases. RFE's Bulgarian Broadcasting Department, giving prominent attention to both the Polish events and the price issue in Bulgaria, in the hopes of eliciting a clear and authoritative Bulgarian statement on the issue, was rewarded in early January by a series of official denials of any such intention. The Czechoslovak Broadcasting Department, asserting to its listeners that both the Polish crisis of 1970 and the Czechoslovak developments in 1968-69 were inevitable symptoms of a chronic disease of the sociopolitical system imposed by the Soviet Union, noted that a panel discussion on Radio Prague on February 2 obliged the Director of Czechoslovak broadcasting to answer a listener who wanted to know if there was a "certain connection" between the two crises. (The Director, Jan Risko, replied that although he wouldn't want to seek any direct connection, the relations "between the Party and the masses" do sometimes "become disturbed.")

The Rumanian Broadcasting Department, which had devoted 15 to 20 percent of its daily newscasts, and 20 to 25 percent of its daily programming, to the Polish crisis, and emphasized the complaints and demands of the Polish workers and the successive concessions by the Polish leadership, was able to observe the new departure in Rumanian policy represented by the February 10-11 Plenum of the Rumanian Central Committee's call for trade union reform and the "further development of workers' democracy," and Ceausescu's own sharp criticism of past trade union practices. Similarly, the 15th Plenum of the Central Council of the Bulgarian Trade Unions on February 18 and 19 exhibited a more pronounced "concern for the individual," and urged basic trade union organizations to pay more and better attention to satisfying "the interests of the workers' collectives"; shortly thereafter there were a number of changes in the Bulgarian Trade Union leadership. To the extent that these events represent the influence of the Polish crisis among the Bulgarian or Rumanian workers, they were in large measure due to broadcasting by RFE, for RFE was the Bulgarian or Rumanian workers' primary source of full and continuous information on Polish developments during the period.

[From Facts and Views of the Week No. 68, Nov. 8, 1970]

# COST OF LIVING IN POLAND

(By Mr. Podgorski)

The average monthly cost of living for one person, even a child, amounts to at least 1,000 zl. at the present time—our listeners in Poland complain to us again and again. I should point out right from the start, for the sake of accuracy, that the reference here is to normal average cost, excluding all “major investments”, such as for instance, the purchase of a new suit of clothes.

What is one to think of these comments?

In the Statistical Annual for the year 1969, there is no factual information about the cost of living structure in Poland. The material drawn up by the Central Statistical Office only gives general indices the accuracy of which seems very dubious. Thus, for instance:

On page 909, in the chapter on incomes and consumption there is a table in which one finds that the cost of living index presents a very favorable picture. Especially in comparison with the index on the growth of nominal wages. The CSO intimates reassuringly that over a period of 13 years, that is, between 1955 and 1968 the index on the rise of earnings has tripled. As for the cost of living index, the table indicates that it increased by barely one-third. A comparison of these two figures would seem to suggest that the population of People's Poland is now at least twice as well-off as it used to be at the time when Gomulka came to power.

Unfortunately, an analysis of these indices reveals a completely different picture. Consider, for example, the index relating to real wages after taking into consideration the fluctuation of prices: it indicates the same level as the index relating to the rise in cost of living. This points to the sad truth that during the thirteen-year period between 1955-1968 there was no essential improvement in the standard of living of the average citizen.

Let us consider one other comparison. An instructive illustration of the true ratio of average earnings and average prices, and by the same token, average cost of living, is furnished by the amount of a family's earnings which has to be spent on the purchase of food. Under PUWP—government it devours a very substantial part of a family's income. During the period in question, expenditure on food slashed more than half of a citizen's income. In contrast, a citizen in Western European countries only spends between one-fourth and one-third of his income on food. The difficult living conditions of the contemporary “statistical” Pole is best illustrated by the fact that as much as 84% of his income is used up for food, clothing, housing, light and heating. The amount left for leisure-time and cultural activities, for durable investments and for savings is so meagre, that it is almost impossible to try to split up this miserable little sum of money.

The statistical data which illustrates the structure of consumption is even more significant. The amount spent on food totalled more than 580 zl. a month, per capita of population in People's Poland—and that was already two years ago. When one adds to this the other indispensable expenses also included in the statistical picture, it will readily be seen that the average monthly cost of living per person since—at least—the past two years amounts to more than 1,000 zl. Thus, the complaints we have been receiving from listeners concerning the decidedly unpropitious structure of the cost of living in relation to the level of wages—are fully substantiated.

Let us look at the problem from a different angle. According to the data for 1968, the average nominal gross income amounted to less than 2,300 zl. per month. Assuming that one out of three persons earns a living in the PRL nowadays, and the average monthly cost of living amounts to more than 1,000 zl. per capita, we arrive at the conclusion that “official” average earnings are not sufficient to provide for the upkeep of a family. For it follows from a simple calculation that roughly one out of three PRL citizens does not have enough money to pay for its upkeep. In consequence, a large number of people have to look for additional sources of income and often, in doing so, they do not concern themselves too much with the letter of the law.

So now we know where to trace the cause of the desperate search for ‘half-time’ and ‘quarter-time’ jobs! That's the reason for the menace of moonlighting during work-hours, common to all work establishments! That's the cause of innumerable machinations, goods sold “under the counter” and the ever more numerous embezzlements. That is the price which must now be paid for the dishonest policy on wages and prices. When the covert and overt rise in prices imme-

diately devours the meagre doses of pay-raises, it is understandable that the practice of semi-legal and illegal machinations in an effort to make ends meet somehow, is bound to flourish. So as to provide for that third "statistical" family-member, for whose upkeep the official statistical earnings are simply inadequate.

We all know what the consequences of this situation are. Under-paid employees do not want to work efficiently. Conscientious work certainly does not pay in the PUWP system of government. But the persons who are responsible for this state of affairs should not be sought in the factories and work establishments, but rather at the top of the pyramid of authority, where the vital decisions are made on the ratio between cost of living and remuneration for work.

#### THE DISASTROUS PRICE INCREASES IN POLAND

(By T. Nowakowski)

NARRAT. To tell you the truth, we should really begin today's program with a loud and soldierly swearword, thus "taking the word out of the mouths" of millions of utterly indignant citizens in our country, who are not allowed to call a spade a spade.

A "black" Sunday. The unlucky thirteenth. A sinister gift laid by the Party and government leadership under the Christmas tree of millions of Poles.

VOICE. On December 13—Sunday—all stations of the Polish Radio made public the text of the Council of Ministers bill announcing drastic price increases.

NARRAT. That's right: an increase in prices! And to mislead the population, the communique began by enumerating all those commodities which will become cheaper. This applies mainly to products which for a long time cluttered up warehouses because there was no demand for them, and they certainly cannot be considered as "basic necessities." Of what use is it to a citizen if the price of tape-recorders, or old, unpopular records goes down, or the price of that famous asphalt-saturated felt whose quality had been causing complaints from the countryside since time immemorial—what's the use of that, if the price of food has substantially gone up?

VOICE. There's a considerable increase in the prices of meat, all processed meat products, lard and bacon, wheat and rye flour, (pickled) herrings, fish, bakery products, groats, cheese, milk, jam, preserves—in short, everything, that's indispensable. The things that every housewife needs to prepare a meal. The things which all working people need in order to live.

VOICE. Coal, coke and bricks will become considerably more expensive—just when Winter has begun! Wood for heating will cost more. Shirts will cost more. So will nails, bricks and roofing tiles. A painful blow for the farmer who might want to build something or do some repairs on his farm. It was officially announced that prices will go up in restaurants, snack-bars and canteens.

VOICE II. The list of foodstuffs and industrial products whose prices have substantially been hiked as of December 13—is a long and depressing one.

NARRAT. Another thing that makes people equally indignant is the complete disregard for the public, the contempt for their needs and demands. People are indignant at the synical commentary attached to the new bill, which tries to persuade the population that—we quote verbatim:

VOICE. This is a move which is of the utmost significance to the further economic development of Poland.

NARRAT. A fine development, indeed! Once again, the structure of consumption has been adjusted to the errors of planning, on the assumption that the citizen is a patient upon whom surgical experiments can be performed without an anesthetic. I wonder if even a single one of those Deputies to the Sejm who maintain that they have the confidence of their voters and that they represent their interests—will submit an interpellation in the building in Wiejska Street (parliament—Tr.)

VOICE. It is inconceivable that a drastic price increase such as this in Britain or in France should fail to evoke criticism in the press and in parliament, and have the Trade Unions "up in arms". In our country, however, the central TU-actif has already endorsed the decision of the Council of Ministers.

NARRAT. Before long, no doubt, pseudo-scientific articles are likely to crop up in the Party press, trying to persuade readers that grain coffee—the price of which has gone up by as much as 92%!—is very bad for a man's health, like the imported coffee, and that instead of feasting on meat, the citizen should eat roots and berries that anyone can find in the woods. But one really doesn't feel like joking anymore. It's hard to display a sense of humor in the face of the atmos-

phere of public exasperation provoked by the draconian decree of the Council of Ministers.

NARRAT. The unexpected, drastic increase of food prices in Poland has already produced reverberations in the foreign press. (There follow some excerpts from the cable of the LE MONDE correspondent in Warsaw.)

NARRAT. We might add that if the decision to hike food prices had been announced about two weeks earlier, the Polish Emigration which is always concerned about the fate of the people back home, could have organized the dispatch of many thousands of food parcels still before Christmas. But in view of the snail's pace of customs formalities in Poland, these parcels can no longer make it before the holiday.

Musical Interlude.

RADIO FREE EUROPE, MUNICH, GERMANY, POLISH BROADCASTING DEPARTMENT

Program title—Daily Commentary No. 1474.

Air date—14 December 1970.

Length—9'45".

Subtitle—Propaganda about pricing list.

Author—L. Perzanowski.

Approved by—J. Nowak.

Translated by—W. Stankowska.

#### OPENING ANNOUNCEMENT

NARRATOR. A direct, general corollary of the whole Party propaganda about the increase in prices is to be formulated as follows: the rise in prices is to be blamed on the people who bought too much food and too few industrial products.

In this formulation I do not deviate a bit from the logics of the Party spokesmen commenting on the rise in prices. I have summarized all that in one sentence to show in full the improbable absurdity of the arguments put forward by the Party propaganda in its attempts to justify the raising of prices.

This time again—as throughout the last 25 years—the authorities ruling on the principle of total monopoly of power failed to say one word of self-criticism, to make one gesture of admission that total power also means total responsibility for wrongs done to the people.

This time again—as throughout the last 25 years—the official propaganda maintains that the regime is excellent, it is only the society which is bad.

This time again—as throughout the last 25 years—the level of the official economic argumentation is an insult to the common sense and intelligence of the people.

Logical acrobatics starts already with the very resolution of the Council of Ministers about the price increases. Will you listen, please:

VOICE. Lower prices were set on shoes: on certain kinds of artificial-leather boots, which are now 22% cheaper.

NARRATOR. And another excerpt:

VOICE. Prices of certain kinds of leather shoes will be raised by 23.8%.

NARRATOR. This means that the prices of shoes made of artificial leather, which nobody buys, were lowered, whereas the prices of leather shoes, the only kind of shoes worth buying and bought by everyone, were raised.

There are more examples to that effect: prices of "certain" kinds of toothpaste were lowered, whereas the price of the "Nivea" toothpaste, most popular and in greatest demand, was raised. Prices of "certain" kinds of table glassware were lowered, but at the same time the price of tea glasses which are the most indispensable and most frequently bought type of household glass were raised. Prices of "certain" sports and touristic equipment were lowered, but the prices of bikes and motorbikes, the most popular touristic commodities in Poland, were raised. The prices of "certain" products of paper industry were lowered, while the prices of "certain paper products" were raised. It is interesting why it was not said precisely which products are cheaper and which more expensive now, but I bet that the more expensive "paper products" include either toilet paper or writing paper, or both. Some perfumes are cheaper now, but baby powders and lotions which are articles of primary importance are about 16% more expensive.

This list can go and on, as you can see for yourselves reading the resolution of the Ministers Council.

The text of the resolution was announced by Polish Radio on Saturday, at 22 hours, several hours after shops have been closed, so that people were prevented

from buying anything at previous price before Christmas. Later Polish Radio said in a broadcast:

VOICE. The resolution of the Council of Ministers concerning a change in retail prices is of utmost importance for the continuation of Poland's economic development.

NARRATOR. Untrue. We heard identical statements three years ago, when the prices of meat were drastically raised by the authorities.

VOICE. The change in prices will not increase the budget revenue.

NARRATOR. Then what was the idea of increasing prices?

VOICE. So far the prices of a great majority of foods have not covered the production costs, and in particular cases they have not even covered the cost of procurement of agricultural products. Losses arising from this situation had to be covered from the state budget.

NARRATOR. In other words—at present the state will not have to subsidize the prices of these goods from its budget. But would not the authorities disclose for what the vast amounts of money saved in this way would be used?

VOICE. Prices of basic food articles, with the exception of meat products, have not been changed for years.

NARRATOR. Untrue. The prices of all, without one exception, foods were raised in the last years and are still going up at an even quicker rate, only there are no official communiques about this.

VOICE. New relation between the prices of food and industrial products will contribute to the market equilibrium and will favor changes in the structure of consumption and production adjusting it to the needs and economic possibilities of our country which becomes more and more industrialized.

NARRATOR. The "new relation" means that instead of a sausage one can buy a safety razor "Pol-Silver"; "new relation" means that the average worker who now will spend all his wages on food for himself and his family—will shed tears of joy because the price of TV sets was lowered from 10,000 zloty to 9,000 zloty.

In short—here is another evidence for the extent of the PRL rulers' disregard of the society, the rulers who think that the people will believe any nonsense.

Commentaries broadcast by Polish Radio on Sunday followed the same line, so all this was not said at random, but was part of coherent tactics.

On Sunday we heard the following thoughts:

VOICE. It has to be recalled that affluent societies are not rich because of what they eat but because of what they possess in durable goods.

NARRATOR. This maxim was uttered by a certain Andrzej Hetmanek to whom I prophesy a great career in the field of the Party propaganda.

But even Hetmanek did not surpass a certain Jerzy Kowalski who presented the following "economic calculations" to listeners:

VOICE. An extra outlay of about one billion two hundred million zloty is anticipated for the next year. This is calculated on the macroeconomic scale for the country as a whole: one billion two hundred millions zloty. However, if we divide this amount by the number of all inhabitants of our country, we will arrive at the figure of about 40 zloty of additional expenses per an average citizen a year, which is less than one zloty a week.

NARRATOR. Or: 0,1428 zloty a day, or 0,0050 zloty an hour, ergo—0,000099 zloty a minute. So why all this fuss about silly some millionth fractions of zloty?

Cross my heart, I have never seen anyone making such a fool of himself and those who put him in front of the microphone.

Jerzy Kowalski continued:

VOICE. According to the Statistical Yearly, last year the average Pole consumed 53 kilogram meat, apart from fats, exactly as much as the average Swede whose national income is three times higher.

NARRATOR. This is really shocking and contrary to historical justice. Simple calculations made by comrade Jerzy Kowalski show that a Pole should eat three times less than a Swede, that is 17 kilogram a year, that is 4,5 dekagram a day.

I suggest that Comrade Jerzy Kowalski should for his discovery be awarded all possible Party prizes for journalists and, in addition, that he should be sent as a correspondent to some attractive country. For instance to North Korea where—according to his statistical theory about meat consumption—everyone should have starved long ago, because the national income per head in North Korea is some dozen times lower than in Sweden.

Since March 1968 the PUWP propaganda has not been so hypocritical. One can only wonder that on top of everything the authorities have chosen to discredit

themselves with this kind of propaganda, that they do not understand that their attempts to mock common sense of the people worsen the situation.

What should the PRL rulers tell the society at this moment? Simply: we have failed. Our system is wrong. We are unable to organize the economic life of the country. We are responsible for everything, but the costs of our infantile incompetence have to be paid by you, by society.

Were the official communiques to say the truth, they should say that and only that. Everything else is untrue. Not one man within the PUWP ruling group has shown the moral courage of Fidel Castro.

MUNICH, GERMANY, POLISH BROADCASTING DEPARTMENT

Program title—Focus on Poland No. 74.

Air date—December 20, 1970.

Length—9.45''.

Subtitle—Price increase in Poland.

Author—K. Milotworska.

OK by—J. Nowak.

Translated by—M. Staniszezwska.

OPENING ANNOUNCEMENT

NARRATOR. Even before the price increase and its tragic consequences I meant to write a talk on the verbal equilibristics or, to put it simply, about the nonsense written and said in the press and over the radio about the economic situation. I noted down many such items as, for example: "economic tensions", "the strengthening of the market equilibrium", "the policy of selective development" and "the dynamization of the people's needs". So as not to say that next year there will be a general crash and a deterioration of the situation on all sectors it is said that next year, I quote:

VOICE. The economic plan provides for the maintenance of a relatively slow rate of development, mainly of investments, as well as a slow rate of the growth of consumption.

NARRATOR. Last week's events confirm the cruel truth that this way of writing about problems which are the essence of the existence of 32 million citizens, that falsehoods, silence, calling something which is black white, is an evil method!

The height of hypocrisy was calling the price increase a move on which the citizens will almost gain, or in any case will lose only temporarily and to a minimal extent.

I have chosen a few quotations from the radio and the press. And thus:

VOICE. In the vocabulary of the binding terminology the price increase is either "a change of the ratio prices" or "a relative change of prices".

NARRATOR. Basing itself on the ZYCIE WARSZAWY Radio-Warsaw said the following:

VOICE. The present structure of consumption in the country is not compatible with either the present picture of our economy or with the tendencies in the industrialized countries, and in addition it is becoming an impediment for further development. For the growth of consumption, and especially of foods, does not allow us to raise our standard of living.

NARRATOR. It would appear from this that the less the people eats—the higher the standard of living of the citizens. Following this train of thought, in India where quite a lot of people die of starvation, but do not eat meat—the standard of living should be high. It seems that the rulers of the PRL would gladly bring the Indian and Moslem custom to our country.

In the radio commentary of March 15, reporting on the last plenum of the CC, we heard the following:

VOICE. Wladyslaw Gomulka said that during the last few years the increase of the population's income amounted to 20 and more billion zloty a year, and that during the years to come it will not be smaller but rather bigger.

NARRATOR. This was a quotation from Gomulka's speech at the last plenum. Immediately after this quotation the commentator said:

VOICE. And thus also next year such a sum will land additionally in our pockets. Simultaneously the state will still pay a subsidy of over 10 billion zloty in order to maintain the level of the retail prices of basic consumer goods. And thus despite this very difficult operation of the change of prices, the state will continue to pay 10 billion zloty in subsidies.

NARRATOR. So the state will also lose!? If both the people and the state are losing on the change of prices—then who is gaining on it?

The official statements say—I quote the ZYCIE WARSZAWY of December 13:

VOICE. The consequences of the change of prices will naturally affect families' budgets in various ways, depending on the level of their income and the sources of their subsistence. However in the result of the said economic and social moves these differences will be relatively small. Nonetheless the regulation of prices will temporarily reduce, within the limits of 2%, the real income of the lowest paid working families.

NARRATOR. It will reduce the income of people only temporarily, only for a moment, and only within the limits of 2%!

The TRYBUNA LUDU of December 14 wrote:

VOICE. The decisions of December 12 concerning changes of retail prices and procurement—as it transpires from the communique—examined in the context of economic reforms as a whole—create opportunities for a rise in the standard of living.

NARRATOR. Who are you kidding?! At a time when beef went up by 18 zloty per kilogram, when a kilogram of lard costs 40 zloty, and a kilogram of ordinary sausage 52 zloty?

On Tuesday, during the second day of riots in the three cities on the Coast and while Radio-Gdansk broadcast communiques about people who had been killed and wounded, Radio-Warsaw broadcast conversations recorded by reporters in various shops. In these conversations all the customers appear to be extremely happy with the regulation of prices.

VOICE. For example a Warsaw reporter in a store with industrial goods asks a woman whose husband only earns 2,000 zloty whether she thinks that the price reduction will have a positive effect on the household budget. The woman answers: yes, very much so.

Reporters also make interviews in stores selling television and radio sets, refrigerators, household utensils. Everywhere everybody is very pleased, of course. One reporters also visited meat shops but, strangely enough, this time he talked with the shop attendants, and not with the customers. . . .

NARRATOR. Also according to reports on sales, everybody started buying, particularly stockings, radio sets, television sets and vacuum cleaners. The prices of these goods have been reduced, but they have primarily been reduced because for months, for years warehouses have been full of them as no one wanted to buy them because they were of poor quality and either too expensive, or both at the same time.

Two months ago the communique of the Main Statistical Office said:

VOICE. Stocks of market goods were 11% higher than during the same period last year, and the rate of their increase was two times higher than the rate of increase of sales. At the end of July among other things, a considerable increase of the stocks of radio sets (about 30%) was noted. Of vacuum cleaners by 115%, of polishing brushes by 63%, of sewing machines by 42%. Also stocks of wall material, roof tiles and tar-board increased.

NARRATOR. And thus the prices are reduced simply because there was no demand for those goods. In such cases in normal countries the goods are re-priced without announcing a state price reduction as an alleged benefaction for the population.

And incidentally many goods, not even fit to be re-priced, will now be thrown at the people under the pretext of the reduction.

VOICE. For example the prices of electric bulbs have gone down. But what of it if, for example, bulbs produced by the LUMEL factory burn out after a few days, and sometimes even after a few hours of use.

Stylon stockings are cheaper, for their quality has been poor for a long time: they are not elastic enough, short under the knees, too wide in the ankles and they do not wear well. The stockings are also not obtainable in all sizes.

VOICE. The price of vacuum cleaners has been reduced. Fine, but how many times have the prices of these vacuum cleaners been changed in the past? The ALFA TWO vacuum cleaner cost last year 950 zloty. The slightly newer model, called ALFA K-2, costs 1.150 zloty, and the latest version of still the same vacuum cleaner, this time called ALFA K-2 LUX, costs 1.250 zloty. And so even after the price reduction it is still more expensive than the one last year. And the same thing happens with dozens of various industrial goods. New models, new patterns, sometimes only varying in color or in shape are introduced. And so there are constantly concealed price increases which will not be levelled out even now by the reduced prices of some goods.

NARRATOR. Ladies and gentlemen, this is only a ten minute program. But even if it were longer I still wouldn't be able to cite all similar examples of how the people is cheated. The situation created by this is made worse by the fact that the authorities continue their practice of not telling the truth. Would it not be better to tell the whole truth instead?

#### THE SITUATION IN POLAND—ROUND UP

(By Mr. L. Meyer)

NARRATOR. Last week the Polish Coast was a scene of dramatic and at the time tragic events.

As a sign of protest against the economic policy of the Party, and especially against raising food and coal prices almost on the eve of Christmas, workers on the Coast resorted to strikes. Demonstrations were also staged, which the militia and army troops suppressed with exceptional brutality. Militiamen opened fire at the demonstrators, tanks and armed cars were used to disperse crowds. At least some dozen people were killed, and several hundred persons were injured.

First demonstrations occurred in Gdansk. When shipyard workers, housewives and students in protest demonstrations marched towards the center of the city, the Militia used marine tanks against them, while helicopters hovering above the town dropped tear-gas bombs on the crowd. On Tuesday, demonstrations in Gdansk recommenced with a new force, and when at night the demonstrators gathered in the center of the town, the Militia used firearms against them. During the clashes, the building of the Party Voivodship Committee and the railway station were burnt, shops were demolished.

In mid-week the situation in Gdansk occupied by troops with tanks calmed down, but in some work establishments strikes continued until at least Friday. Also in Gdynia the Militia shot at a crowd of several thousand demonstrators. Even Warsaw TV conceded that there were many killed and wounded. On Friday, the press on the Coast reported that the Shipyard of Paris Commune in Gdynia had been occupied by Militia and Army units.

After the tragic incidents in the Tri-City, riots broke out in Szczecin and in Slupsk on Thursday.

According to an eye-witness relation broadcast by Swedish Radio, the workers striking in Szczecin attempted to march to the center of the City, but militia barred their way. The workers, throwing bricks, dispersed militiamen. Simultaneously, tanks appeared in the center of Szczecin. Crowds turned out in the streets of the town. Among the demonstrators there were many women. The crowd shouted: "We are workers, not hooligans!", "We want better wages and freedom of speech, but no tanks!". During the incidents windows were broken in the headquarters of the Party Voivodship Committee. Party archives were burnt. Fires started also in some militia stations and in the building of the local Party newspaper in the Hold Pruski Square (Prussian Homage Square).

According to the relation of a Swedish tourist, published in the daily "Dagens Nyheter", the TU Headquarters were also on fire, as well as the private villa of the First Secretary of the Party Voivodship Committee in Szczecin, member of the CC, Antoni Walaszek. According to the same source, about five thousand persons demonstrated in the center of Szczecin on Friday afternoon.

Strikes in some Szczecin work establishments, among them in the "Warski" shipyard, continued through Saturday. Saturday night, Warsaw Radio informed that the situation in Szczecin remained tense.

Thursday riots in Slupsk began with demonstrations of solidarity with the workers of the Tri-City. According to an eye-witness, a Danish journalist, militia attacked the demonstrators at the moment when the majority of Slupsk inhabitants returned home from work. Militiamen beat with their truncheons right and left, regardless whether they hit innocent passers by, among them women.

Only on Saturday the central mass communication media conceded that last week riots took place also in Elblag. In this town also some damage has been done.

Not only the towns on the Coast, which were the scene of demonstrations are occupied by militia and army troops, but military vehicles appear also in the roads. In the Tri-City and in Szczecin curfew is still in force. For several days it was impossible to obtain telephone connection with these towns. Flights to Gdansk and Szczecin were stopped. Foreign correspondents were not admitted

to the Coast, and those who were there at the moment when the mutiny broke out, were evacuated.

It is also known that there were some disturbances in other parts of the country: in Cracow, where militiamen dispersed a crowd which gathered to discuss the present situation in Poland.

According to Western agencies, work stopped also in some factories in Warsaw. The UPI mentioned the car factory in Zeran, a foundry in Warsaw, one of the Radio and TV factories and cement works in the neighbourhood of the capital. If we are to believe the UPI, work was also stopped in the printing works which print "Trybuna Ludu". Finally, according to the Swedish daily "Dagens Nyheter", also in Ursus Works some disturbances occurred.

The 24-hour break in telephone connection with Katowice ended on Saturday.

According to a correspondence from Poland in the London weekly "The Observer", during meetings held in factories throughout the country, many workers demanded a rise in wages and a revision of the incentive system which is to come in force at the beginning of 1971.

#### ITEM BY MR. T. ZAWADZKI—THE CC SECRETARIAT

The new Secretariat of the CC has nine members, like the old one. Incidentally, the number of members and deputy members of the Politburo has also remained the same.

The following have been removed from the old Secretariat: Gomulka, Kliszko, Jaszczuk and Strzelecki. The new CC Secretaries are:

1. Edward Gierek, in a way 'ex officio', because of his position as First Secretary of the Party.

2. Stanislaw Kociolek, until now one of the Vice-Premiers. On December 12 Kociolek attended a meeting of the Party Organization in the Gdansk Shipyards, at which the question of the price increase was discussed. As we know, a strike broke out in that Shipyard in the morning of December 14. Kociolek used to be frequently mentioned as the future candidate for Premier.

3. Kazimierz Barcikowski, until now First Secretary of the Voivodship Committee in Poznan, and previously, for a few years, deputy-chief of the CC Organizational Department, and

4. Edward Babiuch—as we have already said—until now chief of the CC's Organizational Department.

Artur Starewicz against whom—as it was said in Warsaw's political circles—a kind of political campaign was conducted—has retained his position in the CC Secretariat.

It will be interesting to see how the functions will be divided in the CC Secretariat. As we know, each of the Secretaries supervises one of the government Ministries or exercises control over various spheres of public life.

In the present Secretariat Gierek has one of his proteges, Jan Szydlak. He is a former apparatchik from the Union of Polish Youth (ZMP), and later he was for a few years one of the Secretaries of the Voivodship Committee in Katowice, under Gierek.

The present personnel changes at the highest Party level will undoubtedly be followed by certain changes on the Voivodship level. Someone will have to take the place of the First Secretary of the Voivodship Committee in Poznan, now vacated by Barcikowski. Someone will also have to take over the functions of the First Secretary of the Voivodship Committee in Katowice, for Gierek will not be able to perform them now. Until now two Voivodship Secretaries, Zdzislaw Grudzien and Tadeusz Pyka, acted most frequently on Gierek's behalf. It seems probable that one of them will take over the Silesian heritage after Gierek.

#### ITEM BY MR. T. ZAWADZKI—DEPUTY-MEMBERS OF THE POLITBURO

Out of the four deputy-members of the Political Buro only one has remained—Mieczyslaw Jagielski. The three others have been promoted to full members of the Politburo. They have been replaced by: Henryk Jablonski, Wojciech Jaruzelski and Jozef Kepa.

Henryk Jablonski is, or at least was, closely associated with Cyrankiewicz as a former member of the PPS. Jablonski made a bad name for himself as the reformer of Polish scientific life, when he performed the influential functions of secretary of the Polish Academy of Science. His present position of Minister of Education and Higher Schooling did not bring him fame. It might be enough

to recall his attitude, full of approval, toward the police terror against the students in March 1968. Jablonski was the gravedigger of the remnants of university autonomy.

General Wojciech Jaruzelski will be the real representative of the army in the Political Buro. Until now the army was symbolically represented in it by Marian Spychalski. Opinions were circulating that the army was hurt because it did not have a proper representative in the highest Party authorities.

Jozef Kepa is, in a way, Stanislaw Kociolek's protege. When Kociolek was the first secretary of the Party's Warsaw Committee Kepa was his subordinate as one of the four secretaries of the Voivodship Committee. After Kociolek was transferred to the Secretariat of the Voivodship Committee in Gdansk, Kepa took his place. It was said in Warsaw that Kepa was the organizer of the memorable meeting of the Party activity of March 19, 1968, at which Gomulka delivered his aggressive speech against intellectuals and the youth. Some ascribed to Kepa the posters calling for firm action seen at that time. It was also said that Gierek's name was chanted in the meeting-room not without Kepa's knowledge. This incident greatly surprised Gomulka.

#### GIEREK'S PROFILE

(By Mr. T. Zawadzki)

ANNOUNCER. Now we shall broadcast first remarks suggested to us by the impression of the news about Gomulka's fall and his replacement by Edward Gierek.

NARRATOR. The new First Secretary of the Party, Edward Gierek, is 57 years old. Before the war he found himself in France, and next in Belgium, where he also stayed during the war. He was a member of the French Communist Party and later of the Belgian Communist Party. He returned to Poland in 1948.

From the moment of his arrival in Poland, he joined the Party apparatus. At first, he worked in the CC, and later became the Secretary of the Party Voivodship Committee in Katowice. In 1953 he returned to the CC to the position of head of the heavy industry department. He was still on this post when the political thaw came in 1956, which helped him to move forward in his Party career.

In March 1956 he became CC Secretary, and during the July Plenum he was elected a member of the Politburo. At the October Plenum he did not put forward his candidature for the Politburo, but was elected one of the seven Secretaries of the CC. In the election, Gierek—similarly as Ochab—received the greatest number of votes.

In March 1957 Gierek was elected the First Secretary of the Party Voivodship Committee in Katowice and he has remained on this post until now. At the same time, he was one of the CC Secretaries, and since the Third Party Congress, that is since March 1968, he was re-elected a member of the Politburo.

Gradually Gierek has become an autonomous ruler of Silesia. Thanks to his position in the Politburo, he could, as the First Secretary of the Voivodship Committee, obtain much more for his Voivodship than the secretary of any other Voivodship Committee in Poland. Gierek, the Party representative ruling the most industrialized district, has shown solicitude for the problems of his area, and, in the first place, for the welfare of workers. Already in 1958, at the Twelfth Plenum, Gierek stressed the urgent need for improving living conditions of the workers.

In the factional struggles of the last years, Gierek maintained an independent position, without committing himself to either side. During the memorable events of March 1968, he was the first among the Voivodship Secretaries to back Gomulka. It can be even said, that to a great extent he rescued Gomulka from defeat. But it does not mean that he opposed the brutal police methods used by Moczar's Security Service towards the students.

Gierek's words said during a mass meeting in Katowice on March 14 are worth recalling. He condemned intellectuals and students no less violently than Gomulka did it in Warsaw a few days later.

During the developing economic crisis, Gierek was critical towards the plans of economic reforms launched by Jaszczuk. Gierek and Jaszczuk were competing in this field, which became quite obvious lately, especially during Jaszczuk's visit to Silesian foundry workers. When Jaszczuk criticized the shortcomings of the organization and achievements of the Silesian industry, Gierek ostentatiously did not take part in this conference, and at another conference, organized by himself, he stressed the need for linking every economic reform with striving for an improvement in the standard of living of workers.

Already once Gierek has directly faced a mutiny of workers threatening the Party. This happened in June 1956 when the workers in Poznan went out in the streets. It has not yet been established to what extent Gierek, as the head of the heavy industry department, was co-responsible for the situation in the Poznan work establishments. Immediately after the incidents, he became chairman of a Party-Government Committee, set up to investigate these events. Although the report of this Committee, called "Gierek's Committee", has never been published, Gierek has undoubtedly learned what force is latent in the embittered and indignant working masses.

ANNOUNCER. You heard the first remarks suggested to use by the impression of the news about Gomulka's fall and his replacement by Edward Gierek.

And now several words about the past of the new First Secretary of the Party.

#### THE WORKERS' VICTORY OVER GOMULKA

You will now hear our first comments of the news of Gomulka's downfall and of his replacement by Edward Gierek.

Wladyslaw Gomulka has resigned . . . He left under the pressure of the working class, under the pressure of the people who, justly seeing in him the man responsible for the disastrous economic situation in the country, said: enough. The mutiny of the workers and shipyard workers of Gdansk, Gdynia, Sopot, Szczecin, Slupsk, Elblag—Gomulka tried to crush by force: with the use of tanks, machine guns, militia truncheons and mass reprisals. But this mutiny spread all over the country in a broad wave of strikes. The authorities realized when it was already too late that no violence could intimidate the people and calm the agitation which spread all over the country. It became clear that there could be no question of restoring peace and order without changing the leadership.

Fourteen years ago the leadership was also changed under the pressure of the mutiny of the Poznan workers demanding freedom and bread and of the ferment which spread throughout the country. Gomulka, who returned to power in 1956 on this wave, condemned his predecessors, he announced a break with the errors of the past, a return to democratization within the party, to dialogues with the workers, to telling them the whole truth. He announced a change of the system and of the methods of ruling, but soon his whole policy became a denial of his own words and led him in the end to the fate of his predecessors.

Directly after the announcement of Gomulka's downfall his successor, Edward Gierek, spoke. There were no more threats in his speech and no insults against the workers who went into the streets of Gdansk, Gdynia, Szczecin and other Polish cities. Gierek pledged to give a self-critical, clear and true answer to the questions which follow from the last events. He announced respect for principles of collegiality and democracy in the life of the party and in the activity of its leading authorities, he pledged to conduct broad consultation with the working class and the intelligentsia. He recalled—as he put it—that the party must keep a close link with the working class and with the whole nation.

Gierek pledged further that within the next few days the political bureau would consider ways in which to improve the material situation of those families who suffered most as a result of the last wage increase. The words about the unpremeditated concepts in the economic policy which became the cause of the events of last week—might mean that under the pressure of the workers some regulations will be recalled.

But it is not easy for the people, cruelly disappointed in the hopes which it laid 14 years ago in Gomulka—to believe in words before they are followed by deeds. The people are faced today with the question: Will the new leadership know how to draw conclusions from the painful lesson which Gomulka gave to it? Will it (the new leadership) understand that rule exclusively based on violence is bound to lead to a catastrophe, that the people can neither be lied to nor insulted. That an improvement of the economic situation is not possible without a radical reform and without a change of the present system, adapted to the requirements and needs of a modern state. Has the voice of the workers, the youth, the women, who also this time demanded not only bread but also freedom—reached Edwards Gierek's ears?

The first task of the new authorities is to reach an agreement with the working world and with the whole community, in order to restore peace and order. A return to normal life is undoubtedly in the interest of the country. This task will not be made easier for the new leadership by the presence in the political

buro of Mieczyslaw Moczar, who is in the eyes of the people the personification of the brutal and barbarian methods with the aid of which the youth's demonstrations were crushed in March 1956, as well as the present workers' mutiny in the cities on the coast. Many people responsible, together with Gomulka, for the policy of the last 14 years have left leading party positions. Also connected with this period is the name of Moczar, as that of the man who built up its present dimensions the apparatus of terror, which casts its shadow on the life of the whole country.

The workers, together with the whole community, have won today their first great victory. They have shown that their will and their demands must be taken into consideration by the authorities. That there are limits which no one can exceed.

(The detailed study referred to is in the committee files.)

#### RFE BROADCASTING DURING RIOTS IN POLAND

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether it encouraged the overthrow of the Communist regime in Poland?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. That was not the purpose of the broadcasting. As I say, the sophistication of these broadcasts has greatly increased over the years, and they have moved away from the cold war confrontation which existed in the 1950's.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you familiar with an article in the New York Times of March 15, 1971, written by David Binder?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I remember it vaguely, but I do not remember.

The CHAIRMAN. The fourth paragraph says:

By spreading the word in powerful broadcasts to Poland during the following days, Radio Free Europe undoubtedly contributed to the spread of anti-government riots beyond the Gdansk area and to the subsequent change of leadership in Warsaw.

Do you think that they are bragging? Is this giving them too much credit?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I think in this sense, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You would say this article also is not correct?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I would not say the whole article because I do not know what is in the rest of it, but certainly that statement goes beyond the proven facts.

The CHAIRMAN. A later paragraph says:

Mr. Czechowicz, 33 years old, denounced Radio Free Europe as a "secret service transmitter" aimed at subverting Communist rule in Poland, and he boasted that he had uncovered "a whole lot" of Radio Free Europe "agents" in People's Poland.

I will put the article in the record.

(The article referred to follows:)

[From the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1971]

#### EMBATTLED RADIO FREE EUROPE DEFENDS ROLE (By David Binder)

Bonn, March 14.—Shortly before midnight last Dec. 15, a 51-year-old native of Poland named Andrzej Przewoski sat languorously in a ground floor monitoring studio of the Radio Free Europe building in Munich listening simultaneously to two regional broadcasts from Poland.

The strongest transmitter at the northern port of Szczecin was playing music. Suddenly the other transmitter at the port of Gdansk cut in underneath the music with a communiqué. It was 11:32 P.M.

What Mr. Przewoski heard was the first official word from Poland that there had been violent demonstrations in Gdansk and that the Communist authorities had imposed a curfew there in nearby Gdynia and Sopot.

By spreading the word in powerful broadcasts to Poland during the following days, Radio Free Europe undoubtedly contributed to the spread of anti-Government riots beyond the Gdansk area and to the subsequent change of leadership in Warsaw.

#### NEWS-GATHERING STRESSED

But in their dedication to the idea of performing as a free press for Communist countries in Europe, the station's officials tend to stress another aspect of their work. They see their Polish reporting as a characteristic instance of how the United States-sponsored station stays on top of and occasionally ahead of the news—not just Eastern European news but the news of the entire world.

Nonetheless, Radio Free Europe has come under criticism recently.

In January, Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican of New Jersey, demanded that the station be subject to Congressional control. He noted that Radio Free Europe was financed by the United States Central Intelligence Agency, despite its "claim to be nongovernmental" and to be "sponsored by private contributions."

Last Wednesday in Warsaw, Andrzej Czechowicz, who had worked for the station in Munich for six years, appeared before more than 100 newsmen to disclose that he had gone to Munich as a member of the Polish Interior Ministry's intelligence service.

Mr. Czechowicz, 33 years old, denounced Radio Free Europe as a "secret-service transmitter" aimed at subverting Communist rule in Poland, and he boasted that he had uncovered "a whole lot" of Radio Free Europe "agents in People's Poland." He declined to say how many or who they were.

#### OLYMPICS AN ISSUE

Regarding the timing of Mr. Czechowicz's revelations, Communist sources have remarked that Eastern European Governments are waging a campaign against the station in an effort to dislodge it before the 1972 Olympic Games in Munich.

Yesterday in Lausanne, Switzerland, the International Olympic Committee said it would ask Radio Free Europe and its sister station in Munich, Radio Liberty, not to broadcast propaganda during the Olympics next summer.

Although Radio Free Europe broadcast live from the Mexico City Olympics in 1968 and covers other sports competitions, it is events such as the riots in Poland that are given the station's main attention. And the Munich staff is proud of what it sees as the competitiveness, comprehensiveness and objectivity of its coverage.

A little over 14 years ago Radio Free Europe was confronted with a similar situation during the Hungarian uprising. But its response in 1956 was quite different.

Then, in a critical moment, a commentator broadcast a translation of an English newspaper editorial suggesting that if the Hungarians would hold out a few days against the Soviet Army, the United States would come to their rescue with force.

The transmission was more or less in keeping with Radio Free Europe's policy of that day, which was attuned to the position of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles that Communist power in Eastern Europe could be "rolled back" and the Soviet satellites "liberated."

The station was then, as it is now, financed almost entirely by the United States Central Intelligence Agency, with an annual budget said to be more than \$21 million. Its Munich director, Ralph Walter, is a C.I.A. man, as are other officials here:

According to a source long familiar with the operation, American employees brought into the inner circle of the station were sooner or later required to sign a paper making them privy to the C.I.A. connection.

The source described the text as saying: The undersigned has been informed that Radio Free Europe is a project of the C.I.A. and that the C.I.A. provides funds for operation of this organization. The undersigned has now been officially informed. If he divulges this information to a third party, he becomes liable for a fine and punishment not to exceed \$10,000 and 10 years in prison.

To his knowledge, the source said, the punishment had never been applied.

#### SOMETIMES SMACKS OF SPYING

The C.I.A. connection, according to the source, has occasionally carried the station's staff members into activities smacking more of espionage than of ordinary news-gathering. He spoke of assignments by Radio Free Europe being given to regularly accredited newspaper correspondents to enter Eastern European countries on missions for the station. "They were paid by R.F.E. to bring back specific information."

The source said he was also aware of the participation of station employees in escape networks aiding Eastern Europeans in flights from their countries. Finally, the source spoke of continuing contracts between station personnel and residents of several Soviet-bloc countries for information-gathering purposes.

#### 1956 WAS A 'WATERSHED'

The crushing of the Hungarian uprising in 1956 by Soviet armor also led to the crushing of cold-war agitation by Radio Free Europe and, in less dramatic form, at the Munich station aimed at the Soviet Union and then called Radio Liberation.

At Radio Free Europe commentators and policy advisers were dismissed or shifted to innocuous jobs. Radio Liberation changed its name to Radio Liberty and gradually toned down its more aggressive commentators.

"It was a watershed, a great shock for the square-jawed freedom fighters, and it forced a change of staff, outlook and leadership," recalled James F. Brown, a 42-year-old Englishman who directs the station's research and analysis section. "To listen to some of our Hungarian commentators today you would think they were Kadarites"—followers of the Communist party chief, Janos Kadar.

Noel Bernard, the Rumanian commentator who was here in the early period, describes the change this way:

"Before 1956 we were an agitation station, telling people what to do, how to take advantage of certain laws. Now we are an informational station, a detached, constructive critic."

At Radio Liberty, which broadcasts in 17 of the Soviet Union's major languages, the policy shift was effected by persuading the Russian émigrés who were broadcasters that calm, objective reporting and commentary worked better than "mere condemnation."

#### A PROFESSIONAL STAFF

A visitor finds that both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are staffed by specialists who take pride in their professionalism. Radio Free Europe has numerous former employees who have gone on to successful careers in magazines and universities. In turn, the Munich operation has drawn a number of journalists and academics to its staff.

The news director, Nathan Kingsley, held senior positions on The New York Herald Tribune for 16 years. Most of his staff colleagues in the softly humming central news room also have good professional credentials.

With more than a thousand employees at its Munich headquarters, Radio Free Europe is a complex organization. In effect it comprises five radio stations directed to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria and Rumania almost around the clock.

#### DOES RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Although it is not the primary purpose of either station, research and analysis of events in the Soviet bloc are important products of their work.

Among the 1,200 subscribers to Radio Free Europe's research papers and press translations are many of the Western world's leading universities, governments and journalists. On a lesser scale the same is true of Radio Liberty's 300 outside subscribers. Radio Free Europe charges only mailing costs for the service.

Analysts like James Brown and Radio Liberty's Keith Bush are well regarded among historians and other professional students of Soviet-bloc affairs. The main Polish commentator, Jan Nowak, is regarded as an outstanding expert on contemporary Poland.

Attacks on the two stations from Communist countries have been made as long as they have been transmitting—Radio Free Europe since 1950 and Radio Liberty since 1953. The employees of both stations have become hardened to them and even regard them as a measure of their effectiveness.

But attacks in the Western press and in some Western governmental circles wound the radio people here, especially when they are branded in the West as "cold warriors" working for "propaganda stations."

"Certainly we were children of the cold war," said Ralph Walter. "But the answer to that charge is that we are no longer children." The average age of the Radio Free Europe employees is 45. It is perhaps a bit lower at Radio Liberty, where the director, Kenneth Scott, has recently hired several colorful Soviet defectors.

The main argument at the two stations is that they have matured politically in trying to fulfill their role of "breaking the monopoly on information" in their target area.

Asked about the disclosure that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are financed by the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. Walter remarked: "Our broadcasting policies are made here in this house and are not guided by anyone in Washington. We are nobody's mouthpiece." A Radio Liberty official concurred.

Officials at both stations were dismayed by the suggestion by Senator Case that their funds should be put under Congressional rein. They argue that the danger in such a step would be to subject their independent policies to partisan political control and reduce them to a "mouthpiece role" identical to the Voice of America.

"If we are compelled to function like the Voice of America, we might as well pack up the operations and go home," said a Radio Free Europe official.

They see themselves as providing a free press for societies that maintain only a controlled press, and they offer evidence suggesting they have had an increasing impact on the controlled press.

"If the Czechoslovak Communist press could have gone on as it was developing before the 1968 invasion, we would have reached a point where we phased out Free Europe broadcasts to Czechoslovakia," Mr. Walter said.

#### ACCURACY OF ARTICLE

The CHAIRMAN. Your position is that it was incorrect, an overstatement?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I think that is an overstatement, that one sentence there, or that paragraph you quoted.

The CHAIRMAN. You know Mr. Agnew may be right. Our media are more unreliable than I thought because all articles written in this area are incorrect, according to the State Department.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I am not challenging the factual portions of the article, but you will note these are expressions of opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

#### REE AND RL ADVERTISING CAMPAIGNS

It is estimated that \$12 to \$20 million in free media time is donated annually to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty for their public advertising campaigns. Can you comment on that? Do you know whether that is correct or not?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, I had seen figures of that kind. I do not know whether they are correct or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that in accord with what you have estimated?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. The figures?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. We have no informed judgment about how much free TV time in this country is worth.

The CHAIRMAN. I have seen many ads, which we call spot ads in political life, in which it has been asserted: "This is a private organization and, in order to save you from communism, would you send a contribution?" It is similar to the appeals of the Reverend Carl

McIntire, Mr. Schwartz, and Billy James Hargas. All these people have similar appeals: "If you will send us \$100, or \$1,000, we will save you from communism." This is the type of ad which has been occurring for many years on the media.

I do not know whether our local media knew that this was CIA-supported or not. Do you know whether they knew it or not?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I do not know. If it was common knowledge as has been implied—

The CHAIRMAN. It is only recently that it is common knowledge. It was not for a long time. I did not know about it really until 5, 6, or 7 years ago. Nobody ever told us. We just found it out by some mysterious process of osmosis. No one in the Government ever told us that it was CIA operated.

WOULD ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN CONTINUE UNDER PROPOSED LEGISLATION?

Would Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty continue this advertising campaign under the proposal that you have submitted?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. This is not a necessary activity of the new—

The CHAIRMAN. Would it be done? It was not necessary before. It was only a fraud because the CIA would have paid it all anyway whether anybody gave money or not.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, this would obviously be one of the things to which the new Council under the legislation would want to address itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it your purpose that it be done or would it be acceptable to you to put into the legislation that this is not to be done?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, actually, Mr. Chairman, I should add, too, that in recent years these programs have not been for fundraising purposes. Apparently—and I can put this in the record or, perhaps just briefly summarize it—these broadcasts to which you have reference were part of a campaign or part of a program of the Advertising Council which sponsors apparently 20 national campaigns a year of this kind. RFE has been one of the beneficiaries, one of the 20, since 1950. There was no campaign in 1967.

The benefit conferred on any nonprofit public service organization by Advertising Council sponsorship is the elimination of all costs of the national publicity campaign associated with space and time allocation by media, and creative talent and time provided by the cooperating advertising agency. The beneficiary organization is responsible only for out-of-pocket costs connected with the physical production of the materials and their distribution to the media.

Well, that is the background on the kind of broadcasts you are referring to. It does not seem to me that kind of thing is in any way essential to the operation of these stations under the new setup which the legislation would provide. But I would not, sitting here today, say that this will not take place because I do not have the power of decision.

WITNESS' VIEWS CONCERNING PROHIBITING PRIVATE FUNDRAISING

The CHAIRMAN. Would you recommend that we put into the legislation they are not to solicit private funds on the basis that it is a private organization or would you oppose it?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I would say that private fundraising should be left open as a possibility.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you would oppose it?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, there are two different things. There is private fundraising, then there is also the question of benefiting by this Advertising Council campaign which could or could not be used to raise funds privately.

As I say, the use of this Advertising Council benefit is essentially a matter for the new organization to decide.

The CHAIRMAN. Personally I am not going to be a party to the continued deception of American public in asking for contributions for a propaganda organization of the Government on the theory that that produces a private activity controlled by private means. I only want your position on it.

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment on that point? I do not want to interrupt your train of thought.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator CASE. I very strongly want to support your position on this. It seems to me that whatever may have been appropriate before, undercover financing ought not to continue, and I think it would be highly inappropriate for individuals to give private donations to this station.

I would oppose it, and I would be happy to have the legislation specifically prohibit it in whatever way you wish to prohibit it.

The CHAIRMAN. I certainly would, too, but the Department is not ready to take that position.

Senator CASE. This is for us to decide.

The CHAIRMAN. I know, but I would like his attitude since he is here.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. We thought the analogy to channel 26—after all, they do ask for private contributions on channel 26.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a cold war organization. It is not designed to keep alive the cold war. It is not a propaganda organization. It is informational and educational.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I do not think this is a major problem.

The CHAIRMAN. It is public and it is called public.

You do not seem to see any degree of deception in palming off something that is called private when it is public. Everybody knows NET is public and if they give to it, it is with that knowledge.

#### HISTORY OF RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

I mentioned a moment ago some material furnished by the State Department as background information. It is not marked classified. I do not know whether that is an oversight or not. But you have no objection to putting it into the record because it is background history of Radio Free Europe. I will put it in. I quoted one paragraph a moment ago, which was the State Department's own attitude.

(The information referred to follows:)

#### RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

Submitted by Department of State

#### HISTORY

Radio Free Europe (RFE) was established in 1950 and Radio Liberty (RL) in 1951. Both are private organizations, incorporated as such (see Tab A).

In the wake of disclosure in 1967 of CIA funding of the National Student Association, the Katzenbach Committee recommended to President Johnson that

it should be the "policy of the United States that no federal agency shall provide any covert financial assistance or support, direct or indirect, to any of the nation's educational or private voluntary organizations." The report also provided for exceptions where "overriding national security considerations" so require. The Committee did identify RFE and RL as organizations which had received covert support.

The Rusk Committee (Tab B) decided later in 1967 that the Radios fell outside its purview (a) because they did not represent a clear-cut case of legitimate private voluntary organizations, and (b) because they had been considered of such great importance to US policy for so long.

#### ACTIVITY OF THE RADIOS

RFE and RL as private radio broadcasters report and comment extensively on internal developments in their target areas and do so in an objective fashion. The importance of their programs (Tab C) and the necessity that they retain their private character (Tab D) are outlined in the indicated attachments.

While some might argue that the Radios are an irritant in US relations with the countries to which RFE and RL broadcast, these countries have shown a readiness to improve their relations with the US—particularly in the economic, scientific, and technological sphere—despite these broadcasts. This is a tacit recognition both of the value they place on relations in these fields with the US and of their assumption—based on their own practice—that such broadcasting is a normal international practice. In fact, clandestine stations financed and operated by the Soviet Union or its allies broadcast—in addition to the foreign language services of overt Soviet bloc radio stations—to the following countries: Portugal, Spain, Italy, Turkey, Greece, Iran, West Germany, South Korea, Laos, Thailand, South Vietnam and Malaysia/Singapore (Tab E).

#### RADIO FREE EUROPE

RFE contains five separate language services broadcasting the daily number of hours indicated: Bulgarian—7½, Czech and Slovak—19, Hungarian—18, Polish—18, and Romanian—12. It starts from the assumption that the audiences in these languages consider themselves Europeans and are interested in what trends are taking place in non-Communist European countries and how their compatriots broadcasting from free Europe assess their own internal events. In meeting this interest, RFE presents objective information and commentary about events in the target country and in neighboring countries. This has in a number of instances strengthened evolutionary trends in the target countries toward societies less confined by dogmatic Stalinist practices and better oriented toward Western Europe and the United States.

RFE is known to have an audience of at least 30,000,000 persons in the target countries. This would be over 36% of the total population of 85.6 million in these five countries. This is the case in spite of the fact that its frequencies are jammed in Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria and recently have been subjected to increasing interference in Poland.

#### RADIO LIBERTY

Radio Liberty broadcasts in the following languages of the peoples of the Soviet Union for the indicated number of hours daily: Russian—24, Byelorussian—10, Ukrainian—13, Armenian—4, Azerbaijani—4, Georgian—4, North Caucasian languages—4, Tatar-Bashkir—4, Turkestani languages—4.

While it is difficult to have an accurate estimate of RL's audience, an indication of its effectiveness is the Soviet government's around the clock jamming of all RL frequencies. This has been done continuously since 1953 and it is estimated that it costs the Soviets about \$150,000,000 annually, or more than ten times the annual RL budget, to maintain this jamming activity. Like RFE, RL is able to reach much of its audience despite this jamming activity.

RL has been a forerunner in broadcasting to the USSR dissent documents which make their way to the West. Leading Soviet dissenters attach great importance to foreign radio playback of news on their activities. These broadcasts spur the dissenters to continue their struggle for political and civil rights.

RL strives to encourage pressures on the Soviet regime toward economic reforms and a more liberal policy on culture and information.

## U.S. FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES

There is no question that steady internal pressures for reform in Eastern Europe and the USSR and for closer economic, cultural, informational, and tourist links to the West are compatible with US policy objectives. The President, in his address to Congress noted the breakdown in the monolithic nature of the Communist bloc, the resultant new aspirations and expectations in the Eastern European countries and their historic ties to Western Europe and to the United States. While stating that the US has no desire to undermine Soviet security, he underscored the right of the Eastern European countries to conduct independent policies. In the case of Eastern Europe, Radio Free Europe works for just such policies, responsive to the aspirations of the people of these countries. At the same time—conscious of the Hungarian experience—it avoids pressing for a pace of change which would produce a harsh Soviet repressive reaction. In the case of the Soviet Union's need—as the President has put it—for “creative economic and social change.” The President added, after recognizing that the US also needed such change, “Both of our interests—and the world's interest—would be served if our competition could be channelled into more performance in that field.” RL is not a tribune for revolution in the Soviet Union as it wants no responsibility for the likely repression which would follow. However, it does activity assist and stimulate the forces for creative internal change in the USSR. This activity, even when traced to the United States causes no embarrassment vis-a-vis a country which actively encourages a party in the United States whose primary loyalty is expected to be to Moscow—the CPUSA.

## PRESENT PROPOSAL

In view of the current feeling in Congress with regard to the Radios a proposal for public funding of the Radios has been devised (Tab F), modelled on the Public Broadcasting Act (Tab G). It is designed, to greatest degree possible, to preserve the Radios' private character just as the Public Broadcasting Act is designed to channel public funds to Educational Television Stations without impinging on their organizational independence. Unlike Senator Case's original Bill (Tab H), which proposed to amend the US Information Act (Tab I) and place the Radios under State or USIA, the proposed Bill creates a private corporation designed to receive and administer publicly appropriated funds encouraging to “private organizations in the communications field which have demonstrated their effectiveness.”

It is extremely important that RFE and RL retain their private character:

- (a) Their freedom to comment extensively on internal matters in the target areas would be inhibited were they to be closely and overtly linked to the US Government or made a part of any Federal agency or administrative body,
- (b) Their licenses to operate radio transmitters in the FRG, Spain, and Portugal are held as private broadcasters and could be subject to discontinuation were they to become governmental entities.

The idea of this new corporation would be that it would pass on, in the form of grants to the Radios, Congressionally appropriated funds in the magnitude necessary for the continued operation of the Radios—a total of approximately \$36.2 million annually. The corporation could conceivably make grants to other useful private international mass media if Congress so desired. The private nature of the Corporation would reduce the apparent involvement of the President and the Secretary of State to a minimum, and in this way refute possible charges that every RFE or RL commentary was an expression of U.S. Government policy or opinion.

While the corporation would be private and not a Federal agency, there would be sufficient provision for policy supervision to assure that the Radios continued to work in directions compatible with U.S. foreign policy interests.

(a) The Chairman of the Board of the corporation would be appointed by the President as would the Vice Chairman and the other thirteen members. All would be apprised at the time of their appointment that they would be responsible for assuring that the officers of the Corporation establish close policy liaison with the Department of State, which would chair an interagency committee responsible for liaison with the Corporation and with the international mass media funded by it.

(b) Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty would have close liaison with State Department policy officials in Washington and Munich.

The Corporation could provide assurances to the Congress, annually if desired, that the funds granted by it were properly used.

(a) It would require full annual reports from the grantees as a condition of the grant.

(b) It would have the power to conduct audits of the grantees.

(c) It would, through the involvement and interest of its Board members, all of whom would be from private professions, be enabled to determine that the Radios and their organizations were not performing any activities other than the broadcasting activities for which they were funded together with the normal news-gathering and new analysis activity which is a part of such activity.

ORGANIZATIONS ELIGIBLE FOR COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL  
COMMUNICATIONS FUNDS

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hillenbrand, as best that can be determined by the Department of State, can you provide for the record a list of all organizations that would be eligible for funds provided to the Council for International Communications, Inc., assuming such a bill is enacted?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, our intention, of course, as I have already pointed out, was that unless the Congress agrees otherwise it will be used initially only for the funding of Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty.

The CHAIRMAN. I know, but the bill does not specify that. It does not even mention these 50 organizations.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Presumably the appropriations markup or bill would contain this limitation. We have no intention of using this to fund other operations which would run counter to or which have not been discussed with the Congress.

(The following information was subsequently supplied:)

ORGANIZATIONS QUALIFIED TO RECEIVE GRANTS FROM THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR  
INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

(Submitted by Department of State)

The Department does not, at the present time, have a list of established organizations in the international media field which might legally qualify under the terms of the proposed legislation to apply for grants from the Council. Under the terms of the proposed legislation, it would be the Council's job to consider applications for grants and to convince Congress each year as to the eligibility of potential recipients for such grants as it recommended. The Department of State is making direct recommendations this year regarding two organizations it regards as eligible under the legislation only because the Council itself, not being in existence, cannot make such recommendations.

The Department has in mind no organizations other than Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty as recipients for grants administered by the Council. However, since future needs for encouraging nongovernmental international media cannot be foreseen, it seems prudent to leave open the possibility of meeting them. The Department recognizes that if in the future the Council is to obtain appropriations for grants to organizations in the field of international communications other than the abovementioned organizations, it must convince Congress that such organizations are not only technically eligible but also worthy of receiving financial support from the United States Government.

RADIO OF FREE ASIA

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hillenbrand, although your principal responsibility is with Europe, are you familiar with an operation called Radio of Free Asia?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Not very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you heard about it?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I have heard about it, but I could not talk about it intelligently before you.

The CHAIRMAN. I will put in the record the letter sent out by Radio of Free Asia appealing for public support. One of the letters was sent directly to me some time ago and also one to a staff member, Mr. Holt.

This also purports to be a private organization. I think it states that contributions are tax deductible. Incidentally, were contributions to the RFE tax deductible? Do you remember?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I believe they probably were, but I would want to check on that before I said categorically. I think they were.

The CHAIRMAN. I think so.

#### RADIO OF FREE ASIA'S ELIGIBILITY TO RECEIVE COUNCIL FUNDS

Would Radio of Free Asia be eligible to receive contributions from the Council if it is set up?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. As far as we are concerned, no. We could give you assurances in writing if you would wish them, Mr. Chairman, that it is not our intent to use these funds for any purposes than for the operation of the two radios.

#### LEGISLATIVE LIMITATION OF FUNDS TO RFE AND RL

The CHAIRMAN. Would you have any objection if we put a limitation in the legislation that this is solely for the support of the RFE and RL?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, we would prefer to keep the legislation in such a way as to make possible, if Congress desires it in the future, to use it for other purposes, rather than to foreclose this in the basic legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. If Congress desires it in the future, it could change that limitation. Would you have any objection if we put it in now? We can always change it later.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Offhand, personally, I would not. I do not see any.

The CHAIRMAN. You would have no objection to our saying that the Birch Society, for instance, will not be eligible to use these facilities to spread its educational programs?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I think if you wanted to put that in there, that would be acceptable to us.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think the Minutemen ought to be excluded, too? The only way to do it is to do it by a general exclusion, isn't it?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Or you can write specifically it is going to be used only for specific purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. You would have no objection to that?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. If you mean the two organization just mentioned, I think we would find that acceptable.

#### SOLICITATION OF FUNDS BY RADIO OF FREE ASIA

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Reporter, I want to put these letters from Radio Free Asia in the record.

(The information referred to follows:)

AMBASSADOR YOU CHAN YANG

WASHINGTON, D.C., December 8, 1969.

HON. J. W. FULLBRIGHT,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIEND: Since you are active in the fight against Communism in Washington, I know that you are anxious to do all you can to help the Americans being held prisoners in Communist North Vietnam.

As you know, American prisoners have been subjected to brutal suffering by torture, isolation, degradation and public humiliation at the hands of the Communists.

With the help of anti-Communist Americans such as you, Radio of Free Asia (ROFA) is fast becoming one of the most important weapons against Communism in all of Asia.

ROFA began its anti-Communist broadcasting in 1966. Each week we broadcast over 44 hours into Red China and North Korea, using powerful 500,000 watt transmitters located in Seoul, South Korea.

Radio of Free Asia is now preparing to mount a massive effort to bring this inhumane treatment to the attention of the American people and to the world. Our campaign will take three different approaches:

First—we want you and others to mail the enclosed post cards to your Senators urging them to take a firm stand and publicly denounce Hanoi's cruelties to American prisoners.

Second—we will make carefully planned mailings of the Reader's Digest article to people such as clergymen, radio and TV newscasters, editors and educators—asking them to speak out against the evils of Communism—as evidenced by the maltreatment of U.S. prisoners.

Third—we will broadcast into Red China and North Korea the truth about how inhumanely Communism treats all captive people.

Our purpose is to bring tremendous pressure to bear during the Christmas season on the North Vietnamese to stop torturing, beating and starving American prisoners.

You can have a significant part in making Christmas and all of 1970 a lot happier for an American G.I. confined in a dark, disease-infested Communist prison. The G.I. you may be helping may be someone who lives near you.

Because of the extreme urgency of the situation, I could not wait until I heard from you before I committed ROFA's money to this fight.

I took a risk in the hope that you would want to help. Please don't let us and the American boys down.

If you could possibly send ROFA your Christmas gift today, we would be able to begin our campaign immediately to aid these helpless American boys.

Sincerely,

YOU CHAN YANG,  
Ambassador at Large, Republic of Korea,  
Chairman of the Board.

P.S. Our finances are very tight. I am writing to you today in the prayerful hope that you will come to our aid and to the aid of the American prisoners of war.

ROFA—RADIO OF FREE ASIA

THE FREE WORLD'S WEDGE AGAINST THE SEALED WORLD OF COMMUNISM!

News—35.7%. Religious Programs—17.1%. News Commentary, Freedom Interviews—28.6%. Cultural, Educational, Entertainment—Special Programs Like Story of Apollo 11—18.6%.

ROFA tells the truth many ways, so that all may hear—and start on a path toward freedom.

TO BREAK THE CHAINS OF IGNORANCE AND SLAVERY . . . SPECIAL PROGRAMS . . .  
SPECIAL EVENTS . . . THAT INFORM AND INSPIRE

Lt. Kim Shin-jo, sole survivor of a 31-man North Korean Communist Commando team, sent on a mission to assassinate the President of South Korea, exposed in a ROFA interview how he had been deceived by his Red Masters.

Lt. Kim said that he was grateful to his former Red Premier who selected him for this awful mission, because through this, he obtained "a one-in-a-million chance for freedom."

A special memorial series of broadcasts based on the inspiring life story of General Dwight David Eisenhower brought truth about America's fight for freedom by describing how General Eisenhower commanded history's largest military force in World War II—and yet he and America did not keep one foot of territory or enslave one single person.

One billion people in Red China and North Korea were denied the news of Apollo 11 and man's first moon landing, but ROFA took the chance of a lifetime—the chance to broadcast every detail of the moon shot and moon landing to the blacked out millions. Over 450 special programs spotlighted the news of man's landing on the moon, the "great leap for mankind" that could only have been made in the free world.

And there will be many more special projects, ROFA is ready. When the free world achieves extraordinary greatness . . . when the slave world of Red Asia makes a disastrous mistake . . . when the call to freedom can be made loud and clear . . . the powerful transmitters of ROFA are ready, the dedicated workers of ROFA are ready. ROFA asks you to be ready, too. Make your contribution to the most effective weapon now working against Red Asia—the truth broadcast by ROFA . . . the truth ROFA broadcasts every day.

#### EVIDENCE OF RADIO OF FREE ASIA "BREAKTHROUGH"

Recently, the South Korean government was startled by the sudden, unexpected surrender of Red North Korean espionage agent Hong Sa Chang. He gave up his Red Spy mission and sought freedom.

It was a triumphant day for Radio of Free Asia. This Red Spy testified that his motivation for defection came long before he left the Red capital. He had been a listener of ROFA and the broadcasts gave him the motivation to defect. This former Red Spy came to the ROFA microphone and gave splendid testimony to millions of captive people.

He said: "I first heard ROFA in the capital of North Korea through my secret radio at night. I could not believe my ears. I was hesitating as to whether I should accept the program as truth. It was a matter of life or death. But when I kept on listening, I knew ROFA was telling the truth and I accepted it. Then I planned my defection. Now, I have freedom and my life is deeply indebted to Radio of Free Asia."

What do the people hear that is worth risking their lives for?

They hear the news. Real news. Not slanted or rewritten.

They hear the eye-witness interviews of ex-Communists who have found their way to freedom.

They hear stories of Great Advancement, dramatic readings of man's ceaseless search for liberty even under the tyranny of Communism.

They hear about the heroes of Freedom, prominent Freedom-fighters against the Communists.

They hear about the Irrationality of Communism—discussions of communist theory and ideology analyzed and criticized by specialists.

They hear about the superiority of Democracy—democracy is explained and extolled by experts in reaching and informing the Asian people.

They hear how it really happened—the truth behind the news which reveals conspiracies and lies of the Communists.

#### A GENERATION TAUGHT TO DENY AND REVILE GOD . . . NOW HEAR HIS WORD

To the Asians, with their deep religious feelings, the denial of God is one of the most terrible Communist doctrines. ROFA's religious programs bring the Word of God to some who have almost forgotten Him . . . to many who have known Him . . . to those who turn in prayerful Thanksgiving to the goodness, the wisdom, the glory of God

#### IN THREE SHORT YEARS ROFA HAS BECOME A POWERFUL VOICE FOR FREEDOM IN ASIA . . . TRUTH TO ONE BILLION ENSLAVED MINDS

In August of 1966, a dedicated band of anti-Communists . . . men who knew Asia . . . who believed in the future of a Free Asia . . . who had fought their way out of the total oppression of the Communist way of life . . . joined together.

They worked around the clock to produce timely broadcasts of the truth. They still do. And that work has paid off in freedom!

When the ROFA staff first started broadcasting, they could only send a message four hours a week. They had makeshift equipment, that was begged or borrowed. And yet, even in the beginning, people listened, and acted. Defectors from the Communists credited ROFA with awakening them to the belief in freedom. Time and again references were made to ROFA by Freedom seekers. The Red hierarchy began to denounce ROFA more and more fiercely as it became a greater threat.

NOW IN THREE SHORT YEARS—LOOK AT THE ROFA VICTORIES

Broadcasts have increased from 4 hours to 44 hours a week, eleven times more broadcasting time than ROFA's initial commencement of operations.

NOW AMERICANS EVERYWHERE ARE UNITING IN SUPPORT OF ROFA

Mr. A. T.—Sodus, N.Y.: "We are retired with not too much income now, but wish to help Radio of Free Asia even just a little"

Mr. V.H.—Pottersville, N.J.: "Enclosed is my check to help ROFA fight Communism in Asia."

Mrs. D.C.—Fairfax, Va.: "I will most certainly send a contribution. I have been donating from time to time to ROFA and think it is a very worthwhile cause. I will continue to do so on a regular basis."

Mrs. H. M. C.—Villa Park, Ill.: "Communism has stifled spiritual development, initiative, responsibility and brotherhood. Thank God for organizations like ROFA."

Mr. S. R. G.—Harrisburg, Pa.: "I am living on a small pension, but please accept my contribution, as I think it will go to a good cause."

RADIO OF FREE ASIA

(A project of the Korean Cultural & Freedom Foundation, Inc.,  
Washington, D.C.)

HONORARY PRESIDENTS

Honorable Harry S Truman  
General Dwight D. Eisenhower  
(1964-1969)

HONORARY CHAIRMAN

His Excellency You Chan Yang, *Ambassador at Large, Republic of Korea*

OFFICERS

Mr. L. William Horning, *Chairman of the Board*  
Col. Bo Hi Pak, *Executive Director*  
Mr. Chong Hoon Kim, *Operations Director*  
Mrs. Sylvia R. Reiter, *Secretary*  
Mr. Charles M. Fairchild, *Treasurer*

Edie Adams  
Senator Gordon Allott  
Astronaut William A. Anders  
Desi Arnaz  
Congressman John Ashbrook  
Astronaut Frank Borman  
Claire Lee Chennault  
Nadine Conner  
Robert Considine

Bing Crosby  
Senator Carl T. Curtis  
Tony Curtis  
Don DeFore  
Congressman John H. Dent  
Phyllis Diller  
Senator Peter Dominick  
Mike Douglas  
Senator Paul Fannin

ADVISORY COUNCIL\*

Honorable James A. Farley	Jane Powell
Senator Hiram Fong	Vincent Price
Congressman Gerald R. Ford	Gen. Matthew Ridgeway (Ret.)
Connie Francis	Phil Rizzuto
George Jessel	Senator Hugh Scott
Sammy Kaye	Dean Smith
Governor Harold Le Vander	Sam Snead
Congressman Donald Lukens	Robert Stack
Congresswoman Catherine May	Admiral Felix B. Stump (Ret.)
Governor Tom McCall	Lowell Thomas
Speaker John McCormack	Governor Norbert T. Tiemann
Senator Jack Miller	Senator John Tower
Agnes Moorehead	Johnny Unitas
Senator Karl E. Mundt	John Wayne
Senator George Murphy	Gen. Alfred Wedemeyer (Ret.)
Hildegard Neff	Johnny Weissmuller
Jack Nicklaus	Roger Williams

\*Partial listings.

COMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Sig Mickelson, Vice President, <i>Time-Life Broadcast, Inc.</i>	Mr. Mark Evans, Vice President and Director, <i>Metromedia, Inc.</i>
Mr. William G. Harley, President, <i>National Association of Educational Broadcasters</i>	Mrs. Mary Dorr, President, <i>American Women in Radio &amp; Television</i>

THESE DISTINGUISHED AMERICANS ALL URGE YOU TO SUPPORT RADIO OF FREE ASIA—  
THE MOST EFFECTIVE VOICE OF TRUTH AND FREEDOM BEHIND THE BAMBOO CURTAIN

Adm. Arleigh Burke (Ret.): "Radio of Free Asia is a valuable and worthwhile means through which communism can effectively be fought and anti-communism effectively nurtured."

Robert Considine: "Radio of Free Asia's programs, in my opinion, are sound and will accomplish its mission. I urge you to give your wholehearted support."

Bing Crosby: "I urge all Americans to support Radio of Free Asia. I know the effect broadcasting can have on our man's mind and action."

Dwight D. Eisenhower (1890-1969): "ROFA is to be congratulated for building a bridge of truth between the Free world and the captive millions behind the Bamboo Curtain."

Congressman Gerald R. Ford: "The Free World must penetrate the Bamboo Curtain with a message of truth for the millions locked behind it or the hearts and minds of those millions will perish in servitude."

Sammy Kaye: "The work by Radio of Free Asia is tremendous and I wholeheartedly endorse it."

Senator Karl Mundt: "The willing contributions of fine Americans in support of Radio of Free Asia are a vital sign to millions of the real meaning of freedom and justice."

Senator George Murphy: "Liberty's foundation rests on truth. Radio of Free Asia's ability to broadcast the truth to the Asian people makes it an invaluable service for America."

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway (Ret.): "Our support of Radio of Free Asia is vital in telling the Korean people that they are not alone in their fight against Communist aggression. I urge all Americans to help ROFA!"

Lowell Thomas: "ROFA deserves the enthusiastic support of all of us who are lucky enough to live in the free world. I for one heartily endorse the campaign it has been conducting."

Senator John Tower: "ROFA plays a major role in containing the communist advance in Asia. I'm convinced ROFA's work is in the very best interests of America and the World."

John Wayne: "ROFA is one of the most effective weapons now working against world communism."

Bob Hope: "By broadcasting the truth to the captive millions behind the Bamboo Curtain, I believe ROFA can be highly effective in helping to bring eventual peace to Southeast Asia."

RADIO OF FREE ASIA,  
PROJECT OF THE KOREAN CULTURAL AND FREEDOM FOUNDATION,  
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1971.

MR. AND MRS. PAT HOLT,  
Bethesda, Md.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. HOLT: If you don't have time to read this letter, at least sign the enclosed petition.

Every American, regardless of how he or she feels about the Viet Nam war, owes it to our men who are prisoners of the Communists in North Vietnam to do something to help them.

And surely, signing this petition is the least we can do for these men who are being held captive in filthy jungle cages.

You may wonder, Mr. and Mrs. Holt, why signing your name on a petition could move the incredibly cruel and evil Communists to release our American Prisoners of War.

The answer is that the Communists are convinced that we Americans are not interested in these men who are held prisoners.

We know this to be so because every Congressman, Senator and private citizen says the same thing when they return from a meeting with the Communists.

And as long as the Communists believe that we are not interested in our prisoners, they will continue to torture our soldiers and hold them captive in bamboo cages.

I'm sure you know, Mr. and Mrs. Holt, from your Maryland T.V. stations and newspapers that Hanoi refuses to abide by the Geneva Convention which regulates the care and treatment of prisoners of war.

Captured Americans are chained in cages. They are beaten and starved. No mail or CARE packages ever reach them. They cannot even write a letter home. Their situation is desperate.

But when Radio of Free Asia sends millions of signed petitions to Hanoi the message will ring clear. The North Vietnamese Communists will know that you and I demand the freedom of the POWs. They will realize that the prisoners are a valuable source of bargaining power.

Once this happens, you may be sure that negotiations leading to the release of American POWs will get underway.

Here's what you can do to help.

First, sign the enclosed petition card and mail it back to me in the enclosed postage paid reply envelope. The more signed petitions we receive, the more effective this program will be.

Radio of Free Asia began broadcasting into North Korea and Red China in 1966. But because of our limited budget, we didn't have enough money to broadcast into North Vietnam.

However, because of the increased reports of inhumane treatment of our captured soldiers by the Communists, I felt we must take the financial risk and so we began broadcasting into North Vietnam.

Unfortunately we will not be able to continue these critically needed broadcasts unless we receive additional contributions in the next few days—as our bank account is very low.

A check from you today for \$100, \$50, \$25 or \$10 will allow us to continue broadcasting appeals for the humane treatment and release of our American Prisoners of War.

Your donation will also allow us to print, package and fly these millions of petitions to Hanoi.

It will only take one minute of your time to sign your petition. If you mail it today, I will receive it within a couple of days.

Cordially yours,

L. WILLIAM HORNING,  
Chairman, Radio of Free Asia.

P.S.—Please accept the enclosed American flag decal with our thanks for getting your petition back promptly.

#### RADIO OF FREE ASIA

#### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT RADIO OF FREE ASIA

Q. Who listens to ROFA broadcasts?

A. There are at least 6 million radio receivers in homes behind the Bamboo Curtain. They provide Communist thought controllers with a sure way to get their

hate propaganda through to people in remote areas. But they also provide ROFA with a built-in channel to reach these same minds with the voice of Truth. There is ample evidence that hundreds of thousands of people daily risk torture and death to tune in to ROFA. Word of mouth, whispered from friend to friend, carried from town to town, spreads the Truth still farther. The Communist information monopoly no longer exists.

Q. Who runs Radio of Free Asia?

A. ROFA is not an agency of the South Korean government—or any government. It is a project of the Korean Cultural & Freedom Foundation, Inc. headquartered in Washington, D.C. Its Directors and Advisory Council include distinguished Americans from all walks of life.

The work of ROFA is entirely financed by the voluntary private contributions of freedom-loving people throughout America and the free world. ROFA receives no subsidy or financial aid of any kind from the U.S. government. Your contributions to ROFA are tax deductible.

Q. What has ROFA actually accomplished?

A. In its four short years, ROFA's successes have been impressive and many—too many to detail in this brief report. A few highlights:

The 1969 Apollo moon landing was totally ignored in Red news media. Seizing this opportunity, ROFA broadcast a total of 450 special programs on the event—became, for millions of people, virtually their only source of news about this “great leap for mankind.”

Eisenhower: Portrait of an American Hero . . . eight weeks of programs telling the life story of a great American who is remembered and respected by the common people of Asia in spite of Red propaganda. Through this Eisenhower Portrait ROFA also conveyed the image of his love of freedom . . . his hatred of lines and oppression . . . his dream of lasting peace.

Interview shows with many defectors from Communism, ranging from North Korean spies and “assassination team” members to ordinary farmers and fishermen, who chose freedom after ROFA broadcasts had planted the seeds of doubt and given them the courage to escape.

Continuous news and special events programs giving the lie to Communist claims . . . exposing Red barbarity and deceit . . . laying bare its atrocities and repressions in China, North Korea, South Vietnam and Eastern Europe.

Q. Can my contribution to ROFA help the cause of world peace?

A. The single greatest danger to world peace in our Nuclear Age is lack of information. Daily, millions of Chinese are being told that Communism is invincible . . . that Red China's atomic and hydrogen bombs can bring them world conquest . . . that America is a “paper tiger” torn by internal dissent and ripe for revolution.

Let this kind of war-promoting propaganda go unchallenged and the trigger is set for a miscalculation that could destroy civilization. The truth can expose the lies, shatter the myths, end the Red monopoly of people's minds. And keep the world from plunging tragically into the atomic abyss.

---

[Reprinted from the New York Times, Sept. 27, 1970]

#### PRISONERS OF WAR: “YOU TALK TO THE RATS”

(By Tom Kelly)

WASHINGTON.—“The worst part of captivity is the isolation.

“You talk to the rats, you talk to the wall. After six months, you don't know if you're crazy. You say, ‘I'm in a Communist prison camp,’ and you've heard about brainwashing and you wonder if that's what's happening to you.”

Navy Lieut. Robert Frishman is a former prisoner of war in North Vietnam. He is 29 years old and now lives in San Diego, Calif. He is very thin—150 pounds on a 6-foot-2-inch frame. His eyes are burning bright and in response he has the introspective air of a man who fasts on purpose, to lift his mind to God.

Only nine have been released and Lieutenant Frishman is one, presumably for medical reasons. He was a prisoner for 22 months, from October of 1967 to August of 1969.

He was sent to a 10-by-10 brick unheated cell in a prison compound, his wound still open. Each night he wrapped his arm in a single blanket and each morning when he pulled it off the wound ripped open. It took six months to heal.

He was interrogated—told that his cause was unpopular throughout the world—and beaten.

The beatings and the interrogations stopped. In the next 20 months, he would be punished severely twice—by being forced to sit on a stool without rising.

"I ate my meals sitting on that stool," he said. "I sat there night and day. After two days my legs swelled up with edema and after two more days I passed out and fell off the stool."

Some prisoners were punished more brutally—their arms tied to their legs in back, they were hung face down from the ceilings of their cells. A man with an untreated broken leg was dragged through the corridors. But the crushing punishment for most was boredom.

Lieutenant Frishman was released in August of 1969. He believes he was selected because pictures showing his great emaciation and his shriveled arm had aroused indignation and some pressure from the West.

He thinks more pressure—from Americans, doves or hawks, and from neutral countries—might persuade Hanoi to release other sick or wounded prisoners and perhaps permit all prisoners to receive mail on a regular monthly basis. In 22 months he received two letters from his wife and two from his mother. They had written 120.

---

#### RADIO OF FREE ASIA

##### THE VOICE OF FREEDOM-LOVING CITIZENS

Radio of Free Asia (ROFA) is a project of the Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation, a non-profit, citizen-supported organization with headquarters in Washington, D.C., and broadcasting facilities in Seoul, Korea. ROFA is not controlled or subsidized by any government agency; its sole support comes from freedom-loving, anti-Communist citizens. Its purpose: to promote freedom and defeat Communism throughout Asia.

ROFA began broadcasting in August, 1966, from powerful 500,000-watt transmitters leased from STATION KBS in Seoul, Korea that can reach 6,000,000 radio receivers in Red Asia. The Bamboo Curtain has been penetrated by ROFA but much more must be done to effectively counter the relentless propaganda of the Communists.

##### ROFA'S OBJECTIVES

To broadcast the truth: While Communist dictators lie and confuse their subjects, ROFA will reveal the true picture of Communism, with all its contradictions, setbacks, violence and cruelty.

To put freedom on the offensive: Rather than just react to Communist charges and provocations, ROFA will emphasize the *positive* values of Freedom and Democracy and present them in a dynamic and challenging way.

To enhance spiritual values: Godless Communism leaves no room for the spiritual side of a man's nature. ROFA will appeal to the souls of these enslaved Asians by stressing man's basic right to believe in and worship God when and how he chooses.

To instill the hope of freedom: The Bamboo Curtain isolates the mind as well as the heart by shutting out all hope of escape. ROFA will speak to the captive peoples as friends, giving them courage to keep their spirit alive for the day freedom will return.

##### THE VITAL NEED FOR ROFA

Today, the focal point of the world conflict between Freedom and Communism has shifted from Europe to Asia. This very minute, young Americans are fighting and dying in Vietnam. Tomorrow, the "hot" war could break out in any number of other turbulent Asian countries. The Communists control a population of almost one billion Asians—one billion people isolated behind the Bamboo Curtain—subjected, day and night, to a relentless barrage of Communist propaganda. Some attempt must be made to reach and influence these enslaved souls with the message of truth and freedom. *Radio of Free Asia is doing this now.*

GEORGE MURPHY,  
Washington, D.C.

83

**RADIO OF FREE ASIA • 1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. • Washington, D. C. 20036**

Dear Mr. Horning:

Please send directly to Hanoi the petition I have completed below. I want to help Radio of Free Asia over its financial crisis. I've enclosed my contribution to allow you to continue broadcasting emergency appeals for the release of American Prisoners of War.

**\$500..... \$250..... \$100..... \$50..... \$25..... \$10..... \$5..... \$..... other**

Name     Mr.  
           Mrs.  
           Miss

(please print)

Address

City

State

Zip

Please make checks payable to: **ROFA POW Project**  
**All contributions are tax-deductible**

### PETITION

His Excellency Pham Van Dong, Premier  
Democratic Republic of Vietnam  
Hanoi, North Vietnam

Premier Pham Van Dong:

As concerned United States citizens we are joining Radio of Free Asia's appeal to your humanity and that of your nation in regard to our prisoners of war and our men missing in action:

*In the name of humanity . . . RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for Hanoi to disclose the names of all POWs it holds, and to urge the National Liberation Front and the Pathet Lao to do the same.*

*In the name of humanity . . . RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for the assurance of proper detention facilities, food and medical care of the POWs.*

*In the name of humanity . . . RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for unhampered correspondence with their families.*

*In the name of humanity . . . RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for repatriation of sick or wounded who might not survive captivity.*

*In the name of humanity . . . RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for the International Red Cross or International Control Commission to be permitted to inspect the prison camps in North Vietnam as has been done in the South.*

*In the name of humanity . . . RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for, in short, an honoring by Hanoi of her legal obligations under the Geneva Convention which she signed in 1957.*

Name

Address

City

State

Zip

(please print)

Name

Address

City

State

Zip

(If additional space is needed for more names, please use other side)

84

Miss MORELLA R. HANSEN,  
2415 I Street NW.,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MISS HANSEN: If you do not have time to read this letter, at least read and sign the enclosed petition.

Every person in Washington regardless of how he or she feels about the Vietnam war, owes it to our men who are prisoners of the Communists in North Vietnam, to do something to help them.

And surely, Miss Hansen, signing this petition is the least we can do for these men who are being held captive in filthy jungle cages.

You may wonder how signing your name to a petition could move the incredibly cruel and evil Communists to release our American Prisoners of War. The answer is that the Communists are convinced that we Americans are not interested in these men who are being held prisoners.

I know this is so because of Senators, Congressmen and private citizens have told me the same thing, upon returning from meetings with the Communist delegates.

And as long as the Communists believe that we do not care enough, they will continue to torture our soldiers and hold them captive under horrible conditions.

It was only a year ago that Americans like you and me first learned of the terrible conditions of these captives—Americans chained in cages, beaten and starved, without mail or packages ever reaching them, unable even to write a letter home. Their situation was desperate. Then our indignation boiled over. Concerned Americans began their protests and thousands of petitions flooded Hanoi and other world capitals.

As you know, Miss Hansen, these protests and petitions have brought action; 80% of the mail that has come out of prison camps in North Vietnam has arrived since the people in Washington and many other American cities have become aroused and sent petitions to show our indignation to Hanoi.

Radio of Free Asia joined this crusade to help captured American servicemen. ROFA already transferred over 90,000 petitions! When ROFA sends thousands of signed petitions to Hanoi, the message rings clear. . . . The North Vietnamese Communists will realize that you and I demand the freedom of the POWs.

But—we cannot stop now. We must persist and keep fighting until freedom of our men prevails. We must continue our untiring resolve.

Here's what you can do to help.

First sign the enclosed petition card and mail it back to Radio of Free Asia in the enclosed postage paid reply envelope. The most signed petitions we receive, the more effective the program will be.

Radio of Free Asia began broadcasting into North Korea and Red China in 1966. But because they didn't have enough funds, they couldn't broadcast into North Vietnam.

Finally, because of increased reports of inhumane treatment of captured Americans by the Communists, ROFA abandoned its planned budget completely and started broadcasting into North Vietnam in an all-out effort to help these POWs. As you read this letter, ROFA is telling the people of North Vietnam that American and world opinion is united in favor of these prisoners. It is telling Hanoi why holding and misusing the POWs is NOT to their advantage.

ROFA needs your financial help to continue these critically needed broadcasts. ROFA needs your help desperately. ROFA receives no assistance from any government.

A check from you today for \$10, \$25, \$50 or \$100 will help ROFA continue broadcasting appeals for the humane treatment and release of Americans held as prisoners.

Your donation to Radio of Free Asia will also enable them to print, package and transmit thousands more petitions to Hanoi.

It will only take a minute of your time to read and sign your petition. If you mail it today, Radio of Free Asia will receive it within a couple of days. I have asked them to let me know when they hear from you.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MURPHY,  
Former U.S. Senator.

P.S. I am enclosing an American flag decal to express my personal thanks for your cooperation in getting your petition back promptly.

RADIO OF FREE ASIA

THE VOICE OF TRUTH AND THE HOPE OF FREEDOM FOR THE OPPRESSED MILLIONS BEHIND  
THE BAMBOO CURTAIN

[A project of the Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation, Inc.,  
1028 Connecticut Ave. NW., Washington, D.C.]

HONORARY PRESIDENTS

Harry S. Truman

Dwight D. Eisenhower  
(1964-1969)

OFFICERS

Mr. L. William Horning,  
*Chairman of the Board*  
Col. Bo Hi Pak, *Executive Director*

Mr. Chong Hoon Kim,  
*Operations Director*  
Mrs. Sylvia R. Reiter, *Secretary*  
Mr. Charles M. Fairchild, *Treasurer*

ADVISORY COUNCIL<sup>1</sup>

Eddie Adams  
Senator Gordon Allott  
Astronaut William A. Anders  
Desi Arnaz  
Congressman John Ashbrook  
Astronaut Frank Borman  
Mrs. Claire Lee Chennault  
Nadine Conner  
Robert Considine  
Bing Crosby  
Senator Carl T. Curtis  
Tony Curtis  
Don DeFore  
Congressman John H. Dent  
Phyllis Diller  
Senator Peter Dominick  
Mike Douglas  
Senator Paul Fannin  
Honorable James A. Farley  
Senator Hiram Fong  
Connie Francis  
George Jessel  
Sammy Kaye  
Honorable Harold Le Vander  
Honorable Donald Lukens  
Honorable Catherine May

Governor Tom McCall  
Honorable John McCormack  
Senator Jack Miller  
Agnes Moorehead  
Senator Karl E. Mundt  
Honorable George Murphy  
Hildegard Neff  
Jack Nicklaus  
Jane Powell  
Vincent Price  
Gen. Matthew Ridgeway (Ret.)  
Phil Rizzuto  
Senator Hugh Scott  
Dean Smith  
Sam Snead  
Robert Stack  
Admiral Felix B. Stump (Ret.)  
Lowell Thomas  
Honorable Norbert T. Tiemann  
Senator John Tower  
Johnny Unitas  
John Wayne  
Gen. Alfred Wedemeyer (Ret.)  
Johnny Weissmuller  
Roger Williams

<sup>1</sup> Partial listing.

COMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Sig Mickelson, Vice President, Time-Life Broadcast, Inc.  
Mr. William G. Harley, President, National Association of Educational  
Broadcasters  
Mr. Mark Evans, Vice President and Director, Metromedia, Inc.  
Mrs. Mary Dorr, President, American Women in Radio & Television

THE STORY BEHIND RADIO OF FREE ASIA

Radio of Free Asia (ROFA), with headquarters in Washington, D.C., and broadcast facilities in Asia, is a project of the private, non-profit, citizen-supported Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation.

No government agency subsidizes ROFA. It is solely supported by sincere Americans who want to defend freedom in America, promote freedom abroad, and defeat Communism by telling people the truth about it.

ROFA began small. In its first year, August to December 1966, 60 hours of programs were beamed to enslaved people behind the bamboo curtain in North Korea

and on Mainland China. As more Americans learned about ROFA's broadcasting on behalf of truth and freedom, they willingly gave their support. Broadcasts were expanded to 409 hours in 1967, 1291 hours in 1968, 1930 hours in 1969 and 2156 hours in 1970.

As war continued in Southeast Asia, wives, mothers, sisters and the general American public became deeply concerned about humane treatment for American POW's and the fate of Americans missing in action. ROFA's broadcasts to North Vietnam in the humanitarian cause of the POW's and MIA's was begun in 1970. ROFA's goal is 2700 hours of broadcasting to North Korea, Mainland China and North Vietnam in 1971.

The four main objectives of ROFA broadcasts are:

1. *Broadcast the truth.* We fight Communist propaganda by presenting facts to show people behind the bamboo curtain how their governments are trying to conceal the truth from them, to confuse them and to lie to them.

2. *Put freedom on the offensive.* We believe that success against Communism depends upon seizing and holding the initiative. ROFA emphasizes the positive values of freedom and democracy, presenting them interestingly, dynamically, convincingly.

3. *Enhancing spiritual values.* America's greatest and most lasting contribution to the world is not material abundance but the high moral spiritual values which enable men and women to live full lives and to live them more abundantly. ROFA tells enslaved Asians of the principle that all men are free and equal under God, not responsible to Marxism-Leninism or to the false priests of Red dogma, but only to God and their fellow man, and that every man, woman and child has the right to worship when, where and how he chooses.

4. *Keep the hope of freedom alive.* Men and women behind the bamboo curtain are cut off from communication with people of the outside world. To the millions to whom Communists say: You have no alternative but Communism, ROFA says: You have friends all over the world; Communism will lose in the long run; keep alive the hope of freedom for the day that freedom will return.

#### ROFA'S PROGRAMS OF INFORMATION AND HOPE

The original moon landing by Americans in 1969 was totally blacked out by news media behind the bamboo curtain. ROFA broadcast a total of 450 hours of special programs on this event to give millions in Asia the only word they had about this "giant step for mankind."

Interviews with defectors from Communism have been broadcast. The moving words of North Korean spies, trained Communist assassins, and ordinary farmers and fishermen who chose freedom have been broadcast back to give others courage to vote with their feet for freedom.

Now ROFA is telling the true story of Communist North Vietnamese inhumanity toward American prisoners of war and their families, and of the growing wave of world opinion against North Vietnam's refusal to abide by the humane provisions of the Geneva Convention.

[From the News American, Baltimore, Md., Friday, Nov. 6, 1970]

#### BOB CONSIDINE: BROADCASTS FOR FREEDOM

Radio of Free Asia is now the most persistent voice raised against the treatment of American prisoners of war being held by North Vietnam.

As yet, the broadcasts with which it bombards Hanoi and the North Vietnamese people have not sprung one POW or moved the Communists officials to release the names of those being held. But it is the best method yet found to get to the core of the tragic situation.

"Hanoi leaders may refuse a petition sent to them through the mail; they can harshly turn down wives of American POW's who travel to Paris to ask for compassion; but they cannot stop broadcasts from coming through."

RADIO OF FREE ASIA is a project of the Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation, Inc., a non-profit patriotic and anti-Communist organization with headquarters at 1028 Connecticut Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C.

It is there that the programs to be aimed at North Vietnam are written and recorded for shipment to Seoul and airing. They are beamed at the prime Asian time, 8 a.m. on two short wave frequencies.

"Each program reports actions and statements which express Americans' deep humane concern for prisoners of war and they put pressure on leaders in Hanoi to abide by conditions of the Geneva Convention," writes Bo Hi Pak, executive director of the Radio of Free Asia.

"In the future ROFA plans to strengthen its broadcasting service to North Vietnam by leasing transmitters in Southeast Asia. With these new medium wave facilities we will be able to create literally a barrage of broadcasts to shatter the monopoly of information Communist leaders in Hanoi try to maintain in the areas they control.

PETITION

Radio of Free Asia

**RADIO OF FREE ASIA** • Project of the Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation, Inc.  
1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. • Washington, D. C. 20036

Dear Senator Murphy:

Please send directly to Hanoi the petition I have completed below. I want to help Radio of Free Asia over its financial crisis. I've enclosed my contribution to allow you to continue broadcasting emergency appeals for the release of American Prisoners of War.

☐ \$500   
 ☐ \$250   
 ☐ \$100   
 ☐ \$50   
 ☐ \$25   
 ☐ \$10   
 ☐ \$5   
 ☐ \$   
 ☐ other

Name

Mr. ☐ Mrs. ☐ Miss ☐

Address  (please print)

City  State  Zip

Please make check payable to ROFA-POW Fund. All contributions are tax deductible.

His Excellency Pham Van Dong, Premier  
Democratic Republic of Vietnam  
Hanoi, North Vietnam

Premier Pham Van Dong:

As concerned United States citizens we are joining Radio of Free Asia's appeal to your humanity and that of your nation in regard to our prisoners of war and our men missing in action:

*In the name of humanity . . .* RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for Hanoi to disclose the names of all POW's it holds, and to urge the National Liberation Front and the Pathet Lao to do the same.

*In the name of humanity . . .* RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for the assurance of proper detention facilities, food and medical care of the POW's.

*In the name of humanity . . .* RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for unhampered correspondence with their families.

*In the name of humanity . . .* RADIO OF FREE

ASIA calls for repatriation of sick or wounded who might not survive captivity.

*In the name of humanity . . .* RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for the International Red Cross or International Control Commission to be permitted to inspect the prison camps in North Vietnam as has been done in the South.

*In the name of humanity . . .* RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for, in short, an honoring by Hanoi of her legal obligations under the Geneva Convention which she signed in 1957.

Name

Address

City  State  Zip

(please print)

Name

Address

City  State  Zip

(If additional space is needed for more names, please use other side)

"Through ROFA broadcasts, people in Vietnam are learning that America is united on this issue, that world opinion is not with Hanoi and that they have nothing to gain by refusing to abide by the terms of the Geneva Convention.

"I must report to you that launching these important programs was not easy, and would not have been possible at this time without the wholehearted cooperation of President Chung Hee Park of the Republic of Korea."

Contributions to the Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation are tax deductible.

#### THESE DISTINGUISHED AMERICANS URGE YOU TO SUPPORT RADIO OF FREE ASIA

Dwight D. Eisenhower (1890-1969) : "ROFA is to be congratulated for building a bridge of truth between the Free world and the captive millions behind the Bamboo Curtain."

Bing Crosby : "I urge all Americans to support Radio of Free Asia. I know the effect broadcasting can have over man's mind and actions."

John Wayne : "ROFA is one of the most effective weapons now working against world communism."

Lowell Thomas : "Radio of Free Asia deserves the enthusiastic support of all of us who are lucky enough to live in the free world. I for one heartily endorse the campaign it has been conducting, and which I hope it will continue until the day comes when such things are no longer necessary. Surely Radio of Free Asia will hasten that hour."

#### ROFA HELPS THE CAUSE OF WORLD PEACE

In our nuclear age the greatest danger to peace is lack of information. Millions of Chinese on the Mainland and other Asians are being told that Communism is invincible, that America is a "paper tiger" which is weak and easily defeated.

If this propagandea goes unchallenged, the trigger is set for miscalculations that could lead to the destruction of civilization. Only truth can expose the lies, shatter the myths, and end the Red monopoly over the minds of enslaved Asians. By broadcasting day after day the truth of America's might and humanity to peoples behind the bamboo curtain, ROFA helps to ward off miscalculations which could lead to world catastrophe.

#### FUND SOLICITING BY RADIO OF FREE ASIA

The CHAIRMAN. This is a very difficult organization to find out about. I tried 2 years ago. It came up in connection with the hearings on the Vietnam policy proposals. The honorary chairman of the board is Mr. You Chan Yang, Ambassador-at-Large, Republic of Korea.

Upon inquiry, we found it very difficult to get anybody to take responsibility for Mr. You Chan Yang, but he was soliciting funds all over the United States, using the traditional computerized letters which our domestic political organizations use. They were obviously being sent to anybody. They were not very discriminating in sending it to me and Mr. Pat Holt and others. Evidently they buy a very large mailing list and they say the contributions are tax deductible.

We had some examples of the most vitriolic attacks upon China and North Korea.

I was wondering how the President would view the continuation of this kind of activity if he is serious about seeking a reconciliation or more normal relations with China.

The President obviously cannot go around supervising all of these activities. I think we might present a situation in which one hand of the Government under this kind of organization will be doing something quite contrary to the announced policy of the President of the United States.

89

Would you mind asking the Assistant Secretary for the Far East, who I believe that is Marshall Green now, if he could supply the committee with whatever information he has about Radio Free Asia. Would you mind asking him that?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I will speak to him, Mr. Chairman. I, frankly, do not know anything about it myself.

(The information referred to follows:)

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,  
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1964.

THE KOREAN CULTURAL AND FREEDOM FOUNDATION, INC.,  
1028 Connecticut Ave., NW.,  
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Based upon the evidence submitted, it is held that you are exempt from Federal income tax as an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, as it is shown that you are organized and operated exclusively for the purpose shown above. Any questions concerning excise, employment or other Federal taxes should be submitted to your District Director.

You are not required to file Federal income tax returns so long as you retain an exempt status, unless you are subject to the tax on unrelated business income imposed by section 511 of the Code and are required to file Form 990-T for the purpose of reporting unrelated business taxable income. Any changes in your organization's character, purposes or method of operation should be reported immediately to your District Director for consideration of their effect upon your exempt status. You should also report any change in your name or address. Your liability for filing the annual information return, Form 990-A, is set forth above. That return, if required must be filed after the close of your annual accounting period indicated above.

Contributions made to you are deductible by donors as provided in section 170 of the Code. Bequests, legacies, devises, transfers or gifts to or for your use are deductible for the Federal estate and gift tax purposes under the provisions of sections 2055, 2106 and 2522 of the Code.

You are not liable for the taxes imposed under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (social security taxes) unless you file a waiver of exemption certificate as provided in such act. You are not liable for the tax imposed under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. Inquiries about the waiver of exemption certificate for social security taxes should be addressed to your District Director.

Your District Director is being advised of this action.

If distributions are made to individuals, case histories regarding the recipients should be kept showing names, addresses, purposes of awards, manner of selection, relationship if any to members, officers, trustees or donors of funds to you, in order that any and all distributions made to individuals can be substantiated upon request by the Internal Revenue Service. (Revenue Ruling 56-304, Cumulative Bulletin 1956-2, page 306.)

Since your operations have been limited, this ruling is based on the understanding that your continuing operations will conform to those proposed and evidenced to date.

Every exempt organization is required to have an Employer Identification Number, regardless of whether it has any employees. If your organization does not have such a number, your District Director will take steps to see that one is issued to you at an early date.

Very truly yours,

JOHN R. BARBER,  
Acting Chief, Exempt Organizations Branch.

DDE,  
Gettysburg, Pa., August 4, 1966.

KOREAN CULTURAL AND FREEDOM FOUNDATION,  
1028 Connecticut Avenue N.W.,  
Washington, D.C.:

Radio of Free Asia and the Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation are to be congratulated for building a bridge of truth between the Free World and the captive millions behind the Bamboo Curtain. They deserve the wholehearted

support of all of us in their mission of bringing understanding of the Free World to all peoples cut off from it by the Bamboo Curtain.

Radio of Free Asia has a vital role to play in winning and maintaining peace in Asia. Countries in Asia that are cut off from the outside world by the Bamboo Curtain lack the understanding so vital to the development of policies of peaceful cooperation. Radio Free Asia can help break down this isolation and open the closed societies in Asia to the free flow of ideas from countries throughout the world.

I urge my Fellow Americans to study the aims of Radio of Free Asia and to give such support as they can to this significant stand for freedom in Asia.

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

RADIO OF FREE ASIA,  
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1971.

Mr. WILLIAM DYESS,  
EUR/CHP, room 5221,  
Department of State,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DYESS: Thank you very much for calling this office in regard to Radio of Free Asia. Upon your request, I hasten to put together overall information on Radio of Free Asia as well as the Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation, Inc., since Radio of Free Asia is a project of this Foundation.

I conscientiously put together all current information, in general. If you do need any specific information, please contact me at any time.

Along with this information, I enclose some reference material. Also enclosed is a booklet on the Little Angels, National Folk Ballet of Korea, which is the Foundation's cultural project and which you might be interested in.

With best wishes,

Very sincerely yours,

Bo Hi PAK, *President.*

RADIO OF FREE ASIA SCRIPT NO. 51

FLIGHT TO FREEDOM

(Svetlana Alliluyeva, daughter of Red Dictator Josef Stalin)

THE DRAMATIC STORY OF THE FAILURE OF COMMUNISM

(Language broadcast in Chinese and Korean)

PRELUDE: RINGING OF ANCIENT BELL AS A SYMBOL OF LIBERTY

This is Radio of Free Asia—the voice of Truth and freedom—bringing you the facts about world events and the message of hope. ROFA broadcasts are made possible by the voluntary contributions of private citizens who believe in freedom and peace and who care about your welfare. Music.

INTRODUCTION

August 15 is a day that will live forever in the annals of all who live freedom on the China Mainland, in North Korea, in North Viet Nam, and throughout the free world. On this day, one year ago, Radio of Free Asia began broadcasting operations—to end the Communist monopoly of information in Red Asia.

No other day in recent history has shown more clearly the eternal unquenchability of man's commitment to be free, whatever the odds against success, whatever the sacrifices required.

While your Communist rulers try to deceive and confuse you, Radio of Free Asia broadcasts the true state of affairs in the world. Our broadcasts come from people like yourselves—peasants, workers, merchants, mothers, daughters and sons.

Through them is revealed the true picture of international Communism—its contradictions, setbacks, failures, violence, cruelty and inevitable collapse.

Two months from now, Communists will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. They have a long record of victories to support their forecast of world domination in the near future.

They can claim that one-third of the world's population lives under Communist rule. They might even claim that the flame of their revolution has finally started to blaze in North America, which they consider to be the bulwark of capitalism.

In your own land, your Communist leaders are telling you that their advanced science has produced atomic and hydrogen weapons. They're telling you that they can soon wipe out American military might. All of this is very impressive.

Yet, there is a calm soft voice you have not heard that has the strength to refute the Communist claims of inevitable success. It is a strong voice because the person is telling the truth—and truth is all-powerful.

#### SVETLANA'S BACKGROUND

She was a Communist; she knows Communism from the inside; knows the Communist leaders; witnessed the growth of Communism throughout her life. She is supposed to be in Russia, but, in truth, she is not. She fled from Communism.

We speak of Svetlana Alliluyeva, daughter of Josef Stalin, the former dictator of Communist Russia.

Stalin's daughter was a person of privilege in her own country, and regarded as being state property. She is, in some ways, the saddest of women. Her mother committed suicide, her father was reviled by his close associates. She left her home and her children because life under Communism became unbearable. Communism is like an old tree with green leaves, but inside the trunk and roots are steadily rotting away. No one can testify to this decay better than Svetlana Stalin Alliluyeva.

Svetlana came to the free world because she wanted to live a free and independent life. She wanted to exercise her human right to believe in God, and to publish what she had written.

Now I want you to hear her and draw your own conclusions. Listen as Svetlana answers the question: What series of events turned you away from Communism?

#### SVETLANA SPEAKS

Well, 20 years ago, when I joined the Communist Party as a student at Moscow University, I believed in Communism, as everybody did—all my friends, people of my generation.

I must say that it was a long chain of events.

Perhaps the studies of the history and social sciences and economics, and Marxism itself made me, well, a little bit critical of many things which I would see around me, and of the things I would see in our country and in other Socialist countries, because it was not exactly what we were told theoretically.

Later, in the last 10 years, everybody in our country, especially the younger generation, but also my generation, became more critical. The lack of freedom was quite evident to everyone.

In the last five years religion has worked a great change in me. I was brought up in a family where there was never any talk about God. But when I became an adult, I found that it was impossible to exist without God in one's heart. I came to that conclusion myself, without anybody's help or preaching. This was a great change because since then the main dogmas of Communism lost their significance for me.

Instead of struggling and causing unnecessary bloodshed, people should work more together for the progress of humanity. This is the only thing which I can take seriously—the work of teachers, scientists, educated priests, doctors, lawyers—their work all over the world, regardless of states and borders, political parties and ideologies.

Announcer: What event determined you to turn to religion? Is yours a formal religion or simply a generalized belief in God?

Svetlana: It is a generalized religion. I believe that all religions are true and different religions are only different ways to the same God. For me, God is the

power of life and justice. And when I am talking about God, I am talking about happiness to live and to enjoy life on this earth.

I feel that humanity should be one, that mankind should not be destroyed. This is my belief in God.

Announcer: You said you left Russia seeking freedom of self-expression? Were you stating your disapproval of your father's rule in the Soviet Union and if so, in what way?

Svetlana: Well, there are two points to this. First of all, self-expression. I mean—for the person who thinks he is a writer, he can write. And this is the only thing he can do. Such a person needs freedom to express what he can do and be sure that his books will be published. This is what I—and many other writers—couldn't do at home.

Now, about disapproval of politics, or the politics of my father. Well, I must tell you that I disapprove of many things. But I think that many other people who still are in our Central Politburo in Russia are responsible for the same things for which he [my father] alone was accused.

And if I feel somewhat responsible for those who are killing people, I also feel the responsibility lies with the Party, the regime and the ideology as a whole.

Announcer: Did the Soviet attitude towards your proposed marriage to Mr. Singh cause you to reevaluate conditions in Russia? If not, what did?

Svetlana: Yes,—how in a country where marriage is allowed by law, why should a person like myself not be allowed to marry by the Party and by the government? I think this is not the business of the government at all.

And the whole thing finished quite tragically because my husband died in Moscow, and his death made me absolutely intolerant of the things to which I was rather tolerant before.

And a lot of other things: I can mention the court, the trial of Andrei Sinyavsky, which produced horrible impressions of all intellectuals in Russia. I can say that I lost any hope that we were going to become liberal, somehow.

Announcer: In your statement [Friday] you said because of your name, you were considered as a kind of a state property by the Russian Government. Would you give us more details about the demands and restrictions on your personal life made by the government?

Svetlana: Well, I was told many times, officially, that I would never be allowed to travel abroad because I would meet the press and this wasn't for me.

Secondly, I was not allowed to marry, officially, an Indian citizen, although he was a member of the Indian Communist Party.

I had some rights which other people didn't have, but as you know, people cannot live by bread alone. We also need something else, and I knew that work as a writer would never be possible for me in the Soviet Union.

Announcer: Are there many other Russians who also feel that a belief in God proffered strength to meet the daily challenges all human beings face? Are there many other Russians who also feel that a belief in God is important for them to meet the challenges of their life?

Svetlana: I believe there are many.

Announcer: Of all the factors which brought you to the point of coming to the United States, which would you say was the outstanding one?

Svetlana: I think that the most important for me was the death of my husband, because I was attached to him, I loved him, I respected him.

And when he was denied in the Soviet Union the basic human rights, it affected both of us. When he finally died, I felt that I completely changed. I have become intolerant of many of those things of which I was tolerant and patient before.

Announcer: Do you believe that religion and Communism can exist together?

Svetlana: I don't think that—I don't think that violence and revolution can go hand in hand with the idea of love for everyone. No, I don't believe they can be joined together.

Announcer: Would you say that you favor a democracy set up on the form of our democracy here as the kind of government you are in favor of?

Svetlana: Well, I believe, of course, your society has more democratic freedoms. This is what I believe and what I see.

Announcer: What dogmas of Communism, to use your words, do you believe have lost their significance or are wrong?

Svetlana: I believe that in the modern world, in the 20th Century to which we belong, in the century of the atom bomb and space flights, to hear that class revolu-

tion can bring people progress has lost its significance. Progress in our time should be reached by the work of humanity, not class struggle. This is what I believe.

#### SUMMARY

If we sum up these words of Svetlana Stalin Alliluyeva—the daughter of Communist Dictator Josef Stalin—she is saying that Communism is not good for people, not even for the Communist leaders and their families.

#### LIFE UNDER STALIN

Now, let us review the conditions of life on the Chinese Mainland under Communist rule today.

For years under Stalin, millions of people were wrenched away from their families, their work, their villages. They were sent to concentration camps. Many were taken because of completely false denunciations. They were tortured by investigator beasts, and taken away, covered with their own blood.

Millions of innocent men and women were forced to move from their own lands into barracks in far-off, strange places and there kept under guard. Many were shot or died from hardships of the life forced upon them.

Stalin was a man without mercy. During the 1930s he initiated a great purge of his enemies—Stalin's cultural revolution—to destroy all who disagreed with him. In these purges, more than 10,000,000 people died for no other reason than to make Stalin feel more powerful, more secure.

The officers of the Red Army were not trusted, either. On one occasion Stalin assigned a General to a new post, then changed his mind and had him shot.

#### SONGS OF PROTEST

The only protest possible to the people came in the form of prison songs. Here are two of them which express the deep suffering, the bitterness of Communist captives: The first one:

Yesterday we buried two Marxists.  
We didn't cover them with flags;  
One of them had the rightist deviation;  
The other one not even that.

And another one:

They finished me, the bastards, they finished me,  
They destroyed my youth,  
My golden hair was turned white,  
And I am on the brink of ruin.

#### MORE TERROR

Stalin's terrorism against those closest to him came to a climax after World War II. Mayors of cities, governors of regions, high officials of the government were taken. They were forced to confess to crimes they never committed. Then they were shot. Just before his death, Stalin was plotting to seize and execute officials of the highest rank—Foreign Minister, Premier and Defense Minister.

#### HOW IT AFFECTED STALIN'S DAUGHTER

Svetlana lived in the comfort of the finest cruelty, but she sensed it, and now she has revolted against it.

Svetlana, who lived through all of this terrorism and bloodshed, was asked whom to blame. She said it was not enough to blame her father, Josef Stalin, alone for crimes committed by the Communist Party. Many now in power in Russia are guilty of the same cruelties. With all of these crimes against the people, farm production was hurt, factory production was hurt. It was all due to the Communists and it was a crime against the progress of humanity.

After Stalin died, his closest associates turned on his memory and denounced him. Communism—"the promise of paradise"—was even betrayed for the leaders themselves!

#### LIFE UNDER MAO

How much Communist Russia is like the regime of Mao Tse-tung!

Mao Tse-tung and his Communist officials have turned your life into one of fear and torment. The cultural revolution and civil war rages on the Chinese Mainland. Communists are fighting not for your progress, not to give you paradise, but to gain more power for themselves. Whoever wins, you are the losers. The people—peasants, workers, writers, cultural workers—you who want only to live in peace, improve the conditions of daily life, enjoy your family and the great heritage of China—you are the ones who suffer.

#### THE MEANING OF SVETLANA'S ESCAPE

Svetlana's escape from Communist Russia and her true words have a special meaning for each one of you.

When you see hate and struggle around you, when you see families torn apart and neighbors taken away for no cause, when you see unnecessary bloodshed, remember Stalin's daughter, Svetlana, who said that Communist dogmas no longer have any meaning. She condemns the crimes committed by the Communist officials in the name of the party, and she said: "Instead of struggling and causing unnecessary bloodshed, people should work together for the progress of humanity."

#### CONCLUSION: THE FAILURE OF COMMUNISM

God made man to live free. No power on earth can—for long—oppose this God-given right. No dogma, no ideology, no government can do it.

In the past 50 years Communists threw God out the window. Communism tried to take the place of God and promised paradise for everyone. For a time there was the life of great expectation, of inflamed hopes. You were caught up on the fervor of working for the promised goal. But are you in paradise today? Can you even see any signs of approaching it?

Look around your home. Look into the faces of your wife, your husband, your sons and daughters. Look into your neighbor's face. Look at your rulers. Now draw your own conclusions whether you have paradise; whether the promises of Communism have been true or false.

Svetlana said that Communist dogma lost its meaning when she discovered that she had to have God in her heart. No "ism" that violates the universal principles of God and Creation can long survive, because it is not founded on truth.

Remember: Svetlana was taught the words of Marx from childhood—words that say matter is the only reality, that there is no human soul, no spirit, no eternal life. She looked around her at what Marxism and Communism did to the people of her generation. And she finally came to the conclusion: "It was impossible to exist without God." She testified, and you heard her say: "Since that moment the main dogmas of Communism lost their significance for me."

#### HOPE FOR THE FUTURE

Here is dramatic proof of what Communism has promised and how Communism has failed to make good on its promises. We, in the Free World, who believe in freedom under God, know that other hearts in Red Asia—millions of them—beat with ours; that others are committed to our cause; that other clear eyes are fixed on the Communist tyranny over the minds and souls of men—a tyranny that will inevitably fall before the awesome power of truth.

On this day, the First Anniversary of Radio of Free Asia, we look forward with confidence in the positive power of mankind's commitment to be free. Despite the torments of today, human freedom is the wave of the future: freedom to discover and pursue happiness, to grow wise and to live in friendship with God and with one another.

#### SIGN-OFF

This has been a special anniversary broadcast of Radio of Free Asia—supported by the voluntary contributions of free people—to bring you the voice of truth, hope and freedom. Concluding music. Station identification.

RADIO OF FREE ASIA, A PRODUCT OF THE KOREAN CULTURAL AND FREEDOM FOUNDATION, INC.  
PROGRAM LISTINGS OF BROADCASTS TO NORTH VIETNAM ON POW'S

Program number and broadcast date	Program title	Participants or program sources	Program highlights
Inaugural broadcast Sept. 9-15, 1970.....	Members of Congress Unite for Humane Treatment of POW's.	Congressman Roger H. Zion of Indiana.....	News report on the activities of the U.S. Congress, the American people and the United Nations on behalf of POW's/MIA's. Congressman Zion says that Congressmen want North Vietnamese to know that their own leaders are leading them down a bad trail and are giving them a bad reputation in the court of world opinion.
1. Sept. 16-22.....	America Unites For Humane Treatment of POW's.	Library of Congress POW files.....	Documentary covering worldwide efforts in behalf of humane treatment for POW's.
2. Sept. 23-29.....	Wives and families fight for humane treatment of POW's.	Congressional hearings and national league files.	POW/MIA wives tell of meetings with Swedish Prime Minister Olaf Palme, Pope Paul, and the North Vietnamese delegates in Paris and the opening of the headquarters of the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia in Washington, D.C.
3. Sept. 30-Oct. 6.....	Congressman Zion presents petition to Mai Van Bo at Paris.	Congressman Roger H. Zion of Indiana, MIA wife Mrs. Wanda Ruffin.	Congressman Zion describes his persistent efforts to overcome North Vietnamese refusals and his breakthrough meeting with North Vietnamese Delegate Gen. Mai Van Bo in Paris. The Congressman presented a petition signed by 406 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. His 40 minute talk with Mai Van Bo is regarded as a major achievement in direct communications with the North Vietnamese.
4. Oct. 7-13.....	Congress meets in joint session to stress unity on POW issue.	Congressional Record.....	News report on statements by Congressmen Albert, Boggs, Bush, Arends, Adair, Ford, Brock, Zion, Murphy, Teague, Daniel, Rivers, Wylie, Morgan, and Zwack; and Senators Mansfield, Ellender, Fulbright, Stennis, Byrd, Scott, Aiken, Young, Allott, and Griffin pointing out that the treatment of POW's is not a military or political but a moral issue.
5. Oct. 14-20.....	Groundswell of activity on POW issue follows joint congressional session.	Congressional Record, UN releases, ROFA press files.	News report on statements by Congressmen O'Neill, Scherle, and Fulton and official statements by spokesmen of Norway, Chile, Greece, Costa Rica, Iran, Tunisia, Nepal, and the Philippines. Congressman O'Neill calls for a public outcry against Hanoi's position on POW's.
6. Oct. 21-27.....	Returned POW's speak out to urge action in behalf of POW's.	Tape of statements and press conference at May meeting of National League of Families.	Maj. James Rowe reports how he was shackled in irons in a small bamboo cage and subjected to mental torture by the Vietcong and how he escaped. Col. Morris Overly and Lt. David Matheny report on physical torture and mental harassment during their years of captivity before their release.
7. Oct. 28-Nov. 3.....	Wives and families push for new action on POW's.	Tape of statements and press conference at May meeting of National League of Families and ROFA press files.	News report on the first meeting of the League of Families held in Washington, D.C. Mrs. Joanne Vinson urges that the International Red Cross be permitted to inspect prisoner of war camps in North Vietnam.

95

RADIO OF FREE ASIA, A PRODUCT OF THE KOREAN CULTURAL AND FREEDOM FOUNDATION, INC.—Continued  
PROGRAM LISTINGS OF BROADCASTS TO NORTH VIETNAM ON POW'S—Continued

Program number and broadcast date	Program title	Participants or program sources	Program highlights
8. Nov. 4-10.....	Disabled American Veterans launch elaborate effort on POW issue.	National Comdr. Cecil W. Stevenson.....	DAV National Comdr. Cecil Stevenson described the Disabled American Veterans' radio, television, and direct mail campaign to produce a hoped-for 10,000,000 letters in behalf of POW's and MIA's.
9. Nov. 11-17.....	National League of Families plans vast new mail campaign.	National Coordinator Joanne Vinson, Assistant National Coordinator Mary Jane McManus.	Mrs. Joanne Vinson, national coordinator of the National League of Families, and Mrs. Kevin McManus, assistant national coordinator, discuss letters received from some POW's and announce a nationwide campaign of writing letters to Hanoi and to the North Vietnamese in Paris. They hope for 100 tons of mail.
10. Nov. 18-24.....	Senator Brooke calls for joint congressional committee on POW issue.	Senator Edward Brooke of Massachusetts.....	Senator Edward Brooke explains the resolution he has introduced jointly with Senator Robert Byrd to establish a joint Houses and Senator Committee on Treatment of Prisoners of War. Senator Brooke says he feels that more should be done to facilitate communication between POW's and their families and to gain better treatment for POW's.
11. Nov. 25-Dec. 1.....	International Longshoremen's Union plans continuing activity on behalf of POW's.	ILA President Thomas W. Gleason, ILA vice president John W. Bowers.	John M. Bowers tells what the International Longshoremen's Association is doing to prevent American flag shipping from dealing with the North Vietnamese and offers to unload Russian shipping in the United States, which is not now offloaded here: on the basis of 1 Russian ship unloaded for each 5 POW's released by the North Vietnamese.
12. Dec. 2-8.....	Fort Walton community organizes nationwide and worldwide effort for POW's and MIA's.	Dave Anderson Rev. Talmadge Smith.....	These 2 leaders in Fort Walton, Fla., disclose how their community of 22,000 and many others have been made aware of the POW/MIA issue through distribution of 58,000 copies of a booklet on POW's/MIA's, and the outpouring of support from women, students, workers, and businessmen. Fort Walton raises \$17,000 to send 8 POW/MIA wives to Southeast Asia and to Paris to get their message across directly to North Vietnamese officials.
13. Dec. 9-15.....	Fort Walton MIA wives stir opinion in Europe and Southeast Asia.	MIA wives Marge Brinckmann and Nancy Bannon.	Mrs. Marge Brinckmann and Mrs. Nancy Bannon, of Fort Walton, Fla. describe their trip to Laos, New Delhi, Rome, Stockholm, and London, their audience with the Pope, the efforts to arouse worldwide public opinion on behalf of humanitarian treatment for POW's, and the release of the names of all American POW's.
14. Dec. 16-22.....	Senator Curtis calls for increased activity on POW issue.	Senator Carl Curtis of Nebraska and MIA wife Cathy Plowman.	Senator Carl Curtis and Mrs. Cathy Plowman discuss the rising public indignation over North Vietnamese refusal to live up to the provisions of the Geneva Convention on POW's and express support for a proposal for an exchange of POW's in Vietnam.

15. Dec. 23-29.....	National League Explores increased world press coverage on POW issue.	National League National Coordinator Joanne Vinson and Press Club President Michael Hudoba.	Mrs. Joanne Vinson, national coordinator of the National League of Families, and Michael Hudoba, president of the National Press Club, discuss editorial opinion by the press of the United States, France and other countries urging humane treatment for POW's; Mrs. Vinson reports that press comment in the United States has increased 280 percent in the past 2 months.
16. Dec. 30-Jan. 5, 1971.....	VFW commander makes world tour on POW issue.	Comdr. Herbert R. Rainwater.....	Veterans of Foreign Wars Commander in Chief Herbert Rainwater reports on his 17-nation world tour, including stops in the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, India, and Southeast Asia, his talks with North Vietnamese officials, and the VFW's support for release of POW names and humane treatment for POW's.
18. Jan. 6-12.....	Civil air patrol launches activities on behalf of POW's.	Col. William M. Patterson, vice chairman....	The vice chairman of the civil air patrol describes CAP's private, volunteer effort on behalf of POW's/MIA's which features distribution of more than 100,000 bumper stickers.
19. Jan. 13-19.....	Congressmen Montgomery and Zion discuss news activities on behalf of POW's.	Congressmen Roger H. Zion of Indiana and G. V. Montgomery of Mississippi.	Congressmen Montgomery and Zion comment on the significance of the Findley-Stratton resolution on the Sontay POW camp raid by American forces, on their own petition efforts directed at Hanoi, and the strong bipartisan support in the United States on the POW/MIA issue.
20. Jan. 20-26.....	New actions at Paris, the U.N. and U.S. Congress on POW issue.	Library of Congress POW files, Congressional Record, U.N. Radio Service, ROFA press files.	Documentary cites 13 violations of the Geneva Convention by the North Vietnamese, covers the action of the Social Committee of the United Nations on POW's, and comments on the U.N. action by Ambassador Yost, Senator Pell, and Congressmen Zablocki, Schmitz, Boggs, and Fisher.
21. Jan. 27-Feb. 2.....	Senator Griffin proposes unilateral POW release.	Senator Robert P. Griffin of Michigan.....	Senator Griffin discusses his concern for POW's/MIA's, his visit with North Vietnamese delegate Gen. Mai Van Bo in Paris, and his resolution for an unilateral prisoner release by the South Vietnamese to increase the pressure of world opinion on the North Vietnamese.
22. Feb. 3-9.....	POW wife reports on communists use of POW's for propaganda purposes.	POW wife Mrs. Wilmer M. Grubb.....	Mrs. Wilmer M. Grubb, a POW wife, tells how Communists circulated photographs showing her husband to be in good health for several years before informing her that he had died on a date prior to their release of the photographs, and describes her plans for legal action through the U.N.
23. Feb. 10-16.....	AMVETS launches dramatic effort to stir world opinion on POW's.	National Comdr. Robert Showalter.....	AMVETS National Comdr. Robert Showalter discusses AMVETS' unique campaign to help POW's/MIA's through a pen-pal and a language teachers' letter writing effort, work with some 800 ethnic groups, and a program for businessmen to take advertisements in behalf of POW's/MIA's in foreign newspapers.
24. Feb. 17-23.....	New year heralds wide variety of activities in behalf of POW's	ROFA press files.....	Documentary covering Maj. James N. Rowe's book "Forest of Darkness," the 100-tons of mail project of the National League of Families, a letter writing campaign to U.N. Ambassadors, the "Let My People Go" project of the Chattanooga News Free Press, U.S. Congress' action to declare a "Week of Concern," the U.S. Post Office Department's POW/MIA stamp, and new year's comments by Senators Javits, Percy, Hansen, Dole, Bennett, and Pearson.

RADIO OF FREE ASIA, A PRODUCT OF THE KOREAN CULTURAL AND FREEDOM FOUNDATION, INC.—Continued  
PROGRAM LISTINGS OF BROADCASTS TO NORTH VIETNAM ON POW'S—Continued

Program number and broadcast date	Program title	Participants or program sources	Program highlights
25. Feb. 24-Mar. 2	New legal attack begins on POW/MIA issue.	Attorney W. Stokes Lemmond, Jr.	W. Stokes Lemmond, Jr., tells of the American Fighter Pilots' Association work on behalf of POW's/MIA's, pointing out the many legal problems resulting for governments and individuals due to failure of the North Vietnamese to adhere to the Geneva Convention.
26. Mar. 3-9	Pensacola organizes 1st student trip to Paris.	MIA wife Mrs. Jackie Kent and high school teacher Miss Marilyn Wolf.	MIA wife Jackie Kent and teacher Marilyn Wolf, who accompanied the 1st student group received by the North Vietnamese in Paris on the POW/MIA issue, tell how the Pensacola, Fla., community was organized to support the Paris trip for the students.
27. Mar. 10-16	Pensacola students meet with North Vietnamese in Paris.	High school students Debbie Hogg and Kip Jackson.	2 students tell of their meeting with North Vietnamese delegate Gen. Nguyen Tuan Lieu in Paris and details of dramatic confrontations with the North Vietnamese and officials of 11 other embassies in Paris.
28. Mar. 17-23	Orlando businessmen launch program in behalf of POW's.	Businessmen Richard Eckstein and Lou Masterson.	Orlando businessmen Richard Eckstein and Lou Masterson describe how they organized a rally for POW's/MIA's in Orlando, attended by some 10,000 fellow citizens.
29. Mar. 24-30	Congressman Lou Frey discusses effectiveness of local programs for POW's and MIA's.	Congressman Lou Frey, of Florida, and POW wife, Mrs. Kay F. Perkins.	Congressman Lou Frey and Mrs. Kay F. Perkins, a POW wife, evaluate the work of community efforts and their relationship to the achievement of effective action at national and international levels.
30. Mar. 31-Apr. 6	New committee plans national protest for POW's and MIA's.	National Director Allan Finger.	Allan Finger, national director of the POW Day Committee, explains how his organization was formed and its plans for a day of protest to dramatize visually America's concern for POW's/MIA's.
31. Apr. 7-13	Congress votes national week of concern for POW's/MIA's.	Congressional Record, ROFA press files.	Documentary describing the purpose of the U.S. Congress Joint Resolution for a "Week of National Concern" and covering statements by Congressmen Anderson, Price, Fascell, Wolff, Gonzalez, and Du Pont, and Senators Brock, Allen, Dole, and Fulbright.
32. Apr. 14-20	American Legion launches program for POW's/MIA's.	National Comdr. Alfred P. Chamie.	American Legion National Comdr. Alfred P. Chamie discusses the American Legion's program for POW's, stressing actions by State legislatures and distribution of a special prayer for POW's/MIA's.
33. Apr. 21-27	America's largest private yacht joins campaign for POW's/MIA's.	Businessman Conrad S. Mikulec.	Yacht owner Conrad S. Mikulec describes his plan to sail to South Vietnamese ports and other ports in the Far East and to use his yacht for meetings in behalf of POW's/MIA's in both North and South Vietnam.
34. Apr. 28-May 4	Miami, Fla. group organizes effort for POW's and MIA's.	Businesswoman Lola Morrow and businessman Ted Kowalski.	Mrs. Lola Morrow and Ted Kowalski, both in business in Miami, Fla., tell of their program to express concern of people in Dade County for POW's/MIA's, through a series of billboards.
35. May 5-11	Minute of silence campaign launched in several States for POW's and MIA's.	Newspaperman Jere Sellars and MIA wife Mrs. Wayne Fullman.	Chattanooga newsman Jere Sellars and MIA wife Mrs. Wayne Fullman launch a "minute of silence" program establishing a time in Chattanooga when everything stops for 1 minute to demonstrate the community's concern for POW's/MIA's.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE KOREAN CULTURAL AND FREEDOM  
FOUNDATION, INC.

WHAT IS KOREAN CULTURAL AND FREEDOM FOUNDATION, INC.?

The Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation, Inc., was chartered on the 27th of March 1964, under the code of the District of Columbia, as a non-profit citizen supported organization. IRS U.S. Treasury Department issued their Tax Exempt Certificate under the category of Charitable and Educational listing on September 17, 1964. Its purpose is to aid the fight against Communism in Asia, help maintain and strengthen freedom throughout the world and promote understanding and good will between the East and the West, through cultural exchange programs.

Former President Harry S. Truman has been serving as Honorary Chairman of the Foundation, and the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower served as Honorary President from 1964 until 1969. The Founding President and Chairman of the Board was Admiral Arleigh Burke, USN, (Ret.) Prominent Americans from every field of endeavor gathered as members of the Board of Directors.

The Foundation adopted the Little Angels, National Folk Ballet of Korea as its first cultural program. This is a native Korean folk ballet group composed of children—the first professional children's folk ballet troupe in the world. The Foundation has sponsored the Little Angeles world tour five times in the past. Their sixth world tour in 1971 includes Europe and North America.

The New York Times gave a glowing review in 1968 saying, "The Little Angels are a phenomenal company!" The Little Angels performed on the Ed Sullivan show three times and they twice received Certificates of Appreciation from the National Press Club in Washington, D.C.

More important, however, is the educational aspect of this troupe. The Little Angels gave numerous performances for the school systems in America, and brought to hundreds of thousands of American students from elementary school to the college level, deep understanding of Oriental culture and heritage. In 1971, the Little Angels are scheduled to appear in John F. Kennedy Center in Washington, D.C., the first Korean cultural troupe to perform in this new cultural center.

The late President Eisenhower was delighted with the Little Angels program and its "people-to-people" aspect. The troupe gave its first American premiere performance in honor of General Eisenhower at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania on September 20th, 1965. Since then, the Little Angels were invited to the White House twice: the first invitation came from Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson in 1967 for a reception, and the second honor came when President Nixon personally invited them to perform in the East Room of the White House on December 18th, 1970 for the White House Christmas festivities. The Little Angels are known as the Little Ambassadors of Good Will and Friendship.

The Foundation launched Radio of Free Asia as the Foundation's freedom project on August 15th, 1966. Radio of Free Asia was designed to serve as a bridge of truth between our world and those behind the Bamboo Curtain. It is a vital voice of truth and freedom for the oppressed millions behind the Bamboo Curtain where isolation is severe.

General Eisenhower gave inspiration and staunch support to Radio of Free Asia. He called this project the "Bridge of Truth."

In the four years since its first broadcast on August 15th, 1966 until the end of 1970, Radio of Free Asia (ROFA) achieved a total of 5,758 hours and 25 minutes of broadcasting in 9,590 separate programs in three languages: Korean, Chinese and Vietnamese and gained approximately 100,000 standing supporters in the United States and the free world.

The Foundation also has organized a project in the field of the development of human resources, in which the Foundation is undertaking a scholarship program particularly in the field of arts, for promising students in Korea and the United States.

The Foundation has the plan to build the Little Angels Performing Art Center as a permanent home for the Little Angels, in Seoul, Korea. This center will include the Little Angels' school. The Foundation also plans to erect Radio of Free Asia's own transmitters in both short and medium wave to enable Radio of Free Asia to broadcast their program on an around-the-clock basis.

At the present time, Mr. L. William Horning, distinguished veteran business executive is serving as Chairman of the Board. The Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation has its general headquarters in Washington D.C. and Operation Headquarters in Seoul, Korea.

CONCEPTS AND AIMS OF RADIO OF FREE ASIA

RADIO OF FREE ASIA

"I first heard Radio of Free Asia in the capital of North Korea through my secret radio at night. I could not believe my ears. I was hesitating as to whether I should accept the program as truth. It was a matter of life or death. But when I kept on listening, I knew Radio Free Asia was telling the truth and I accepted it. Then I planned my defection. Now I have freedom and my life is deeply indebted to Radio of Free Asia...."

This is the moving testimonial spoken over the microphone of Radio of Free Asia by former Red spy of North Korea, Mr. Sa Chang Hong. He spoke these words over Radio of Free Asia to millions of North Koreans who are still suffering under the yoke of Communism.

When Mr. Hong listened to Radio of Free Asia in the Red capital, Pyung Yang, he stated that he was particularly moved by the freedom interview in which former Red reporter Mr. Hwang Goo Lee described vividly his experiences—his life under tyranny and his life under freedom.

It must be noted that the primary goal of Radio of Free Asia is not to encourage defections. This dramatic incident, however, demonstrates that Radio of Free Asia broadcasts do reach listeners behind the Bamboo Curtain and that listeners react to it.

There are almost one billion men and women in Asia cut off from the outside world and fed daily on the propaganda by their Red masters. Radio of Free Asia helps to shatter the monopoly of Communist information for them. Radio recognizes no boundaries and penetrates the Red barriers where other means fail, reaching out to  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the population of the world.

In our nuclear age, lack of information is a significant danger to peace. Millions of Mainland Chinese and other Asians are being told that Communism is invincible and that America is a "paper tiger," weak and easily defeated.

If this propaganda goes unchallenged, the trigger is set for miscalculations that could lead to the destruction of civilization. Only truth can expose the lies, shatter the myths, and end the Red monopoly over the minds of enslaved Asians. By broadcasting day after day the truth of America's might and humanity to peoples behind the Bamboo Curtain, ROFA helps ward off miscalculations which could lead to world catastrophe.

OBJECTIVES

(1) To Broadcast the Truth: "Know the truth and the truth shall make you free." This is an expression accepted by free men everywhere but never so appropriate as when applied to the suffering millions in Asia behind the Bamboo Curtain. Therefore, ROFA's first and foremost objective is to broadcast the truth. ROFA broadcasts the facts about America and the free world, its economy, political system, and mankind's continuous struggle for freedom.

ROFA also broadcasts the facts about Asian Communism and their own rulers; the facts about international communism, its contradictions, setbacks, failures, violence and cruelty.

ROFA separates the facts from Communist propaganda thus helping to lead the oppressed people into intelligent judgment.

(2) To Put Freedom on the Offensive: ROFA believes that success against Communism depends upon seizing and holding the initiative. ROFA therefore emphasizes the positive values of freedom and democracy, presenting them interestingly, dynamically and convincingly.

Radio of Free Asia defends human rights and freedom; ROFA stresses peace with honor, justice and freedom with dignity.

(3) To Enhance Spiritual Values: America's greatest contribution to the world is not its material abundance, but the high spiritual values which enable men to live full lives and to live them more abundantly. Radio of Free Asia provides enslaved Asians with a feeling of the spirit of free men. It voices the principle that all men are free and equal under God, responsible not to Marxism—Leninism or the false priests of Red Dogma, but only to God and to their fellow men. Every individual has the right to worship when and where he chooses.

(4) For Companionship to the Millions: People behind the Bamboo Curtain are isolated by Communist-instilled fear of one another. They are lonely people. Radio of Free Asia serves as a companion to them, voicing and sharing their

hopes one day to be free, giving them courage to keep their spirit alive and pointing out the efforts being made to make the world one of free peoples and independent nations. Radio of Free Asia is a bridge between private free citizens in the free world and the freedom-starved people behind the Bamboo Curtain.

## AUDIENCES—POTENTIAL RADIO AUDIENCES IN ASIA

Country	Population	Number of radio sets in use
China (Communist).....	725,000,000	5,500,000
Korea (North).....	11,000,000	162,000
Vietnam (North).....	18,400,000	130,000
Cambodia.....	6,000,000	400,000
Laos.....	2,000,000	70,000
Mongolia.....	1,000,000	100,000
Total.....	763,400,000	6,362,000

These figures were obtained from the USIA and are based on Research and Information Service documents for the year ending 1965.

The concept of radios in these areas is different from the concept of radios in America where one person may own many sets. In Communist-held countries, one radio set may be for the benefit of a group; for instance, a group of families, farmers, villagers, etc. In other words, access per radio in Asia would be far greater than for one radio in America. Even though radio sets in number are relatively small in relation to population, the impact of radio broadcasting is far greater than that of the same number of radios in the Western World.

Programming: Radio of Free Asia's programming covers five major areas:

1. News: Daily happenings of the Free World, as well as news of the listener's own country is broadcast. Audiences are informed of the true happenings in their own country.

News broadcasts by Radio of Free Asia are current, constant, factual, and comprehensive and are prepared for the level of the people who hear them. News broadcasts provide a correct understanding of the current world situation and provide comparisons with information put out by Communist controlled information media.

2. Commentary and Press Reviews: Radio of Free Asia's viewpoint is that commentary and press reviews are of prime importance because this is where the ideological battle should be fought between freedom and tyranny, between individual rights and state supremacy, between Democracy and Communism, between private enterprise and Communist economics.

These programs analyze international developments in the Free World. The progress of the Free World is compared with the true picture of international Communism. The extensive evaluation and research based on fact is gathered from all levels of the Free World community. Radio of Free Asia serves as a communications link between the private citizens of the Free World and the peoples behind the Bamboo Curtain.

3. Religious Programs: Radio of Free Asia enhances the spiritual values of men. This objective is met by programming proper and adequate religious programs of all faiths.

Knowing that all religious life in Communist countries have been downgraded, Radio of Free Asia through all its religious programs provide these captive peoples with religious thoughts and ideas. These programs consist of short sermons, religious messages and religious music.

4. Educational Programs: Radio of Free Asia informs the people of up-to-date know-how in many fields and how this knowledge has been used to provide a better way of life in the free world. Many accomplishments of modern science are made known to the captive people for Radio of Free Asia continuously supplies modern scientific information. Included are developments in medicine, agriculture, home economics, aviation and space technology.

5. Cultural Programs: Radio of Free Asia provides companionship to the millions of captive peoples. The cultural programs provide not only companionship but also comfort. By reporting the free world's artistic and cultural developments, these programs utilize the universal language of culture to provide courage and inspiration for those cut off from the outside world. Extensive musical programming, art and book reviews are featured.

#### SOURCES OF FUND FOR RADIO OF FREE ASIA

Radio of Free Asia is solely supported by the private voluntary contributions of freedom-loving people of the world. Private contributions are the only source of funds for Radio of Free Asia and they provide the opportunity for millions of Americans to participate in the fight against Communism in Asia and to enhance freedom throughout the world.

Business, corporations, foundations, and organizations have also contributed to the Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation, Inc., for this vital project. Radio of Free Asia receives no government subsidies.

As of May 1st, 1971, Radio of Free Asia has approximately 100,000 standing supporters in the free world, primarily in the United States.

Radio of Free Asia has done, and continues to do everything in its power to live up to General Dwight D. Eisenhower's noble description of it as a "citizen's radio for freedom."

#### ACCOMPLISHMENT AND OUTLOOK

##### BRIEF HISTORY OF RADIO OF FREE ASIA

After the aims and concepts of Radio of Free Asia had been submitted to critical review by a wide spectrum of American opinion early in 1966, it was decided to proceed with the broadcasting project.

Radio of Free Asia (ROFA) was established as a project of the Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation and an agreement was made with the Korean Broadcasting System (KBS) to lease broadcast facilities.

The Foundation established Radio of Free Asia Operations Headquarters in Seoul, appointing an Operations Director in charge. The main headquarters were established in Washington, D.C. where all policies and guidelines are determined and from which control over the broadcasts is exercised.

On August 15th, 1966, the first program was beamed from the transmitters in Seoul to North Korea and to the Mainland of China. These programs were in Chinese and in Korean and were broadcast a total of four hours a week. By the end of 1966, Radio of Free Asia had been able to broadcast a total of 120 programs for a total of 60 broadcast hours.

A special format of programming, known as the "Package Program" is used. This is designed to give maximum and concentrated information within a short span of 30 to 45 minutes. These programs highlight world news, concise news analysis, and commentary of special features of the day—such as interviews and constructive information in the field of, for example, home hygiene, latest tips on animal husbandry and the like.

This same program is broadcast repeatedly during the day, often in different frequencies. This program thus assures the receptive audience that they do not have to tune in for long hours.

Sometimes, listening to free world radio like Radio of Free Asia can become a life-risking hazard for listeners. Frequently, they tune in secretly on concealed radios. For this reason, Radio Free Asia programs are also beamed during the night hours thus providing more opportunity for radio listening.

After the first year, the weekly broadcast schedule was expanded into daily programs and by the end of 1967, Radio of Free Asia had completed the broadcast of 819 programs in a total of 409 hours, 30 minutes—almost 7 times over that of 1966!

Steady expansion of Radio of Free Asia programming proceeded with the succeeding years of 1968 and 1969, because of the continuous support to Radio of Free Asia in the United States by concerned citizens.

In 1968, Radio of Free Asia beamed a total of 2,583 programs in 1,199 hours and 10 minutes. In 1969, the record further advanced into a total of 2,920 programs within 1,930 hours and 30 minutes.

In 1970, Radio of Free Asia marked a special milestone when it initiated its first Vietnamese service into North Vietnam. This program has concentrated solely on giving the facts of true world opinion to the rulers and the people of North Vietnam in regard to American POWs. This program was first beamed in short wave from Seoul, Korea, on September 9, 1970.

The total accomplishment in the year 1970 in all three language services reached a total of 3,146 package programs totalling 2,158 hours and 45 minutes.

The following accomplishment chart shows the yearly breakdown of programs and hours formulating the five year accomplishment of 9,500 programs, 5,758 hours and 25 minutes.

From June 1st, 1971 onward, Radio of Free Asia has made arrangements to lease transmitters in Manila, The Philippines, to beam the Vietnamese program to North Vietnam thereby lessening the broadcast distance and improving reception in North Vietnam.

RADIO OF FREE ASIA 5-YEAR ACCOMPLISHMENTS, NUMBERS AND HOURS OF BROADCASTS AS OF DEC. 31, 1970

	Programs	Hours	Minutes
1966:			
Korean broadcasts.....	80	40	
Chinese broadcasts.....	40	20	
Subtotal.....	120	60	
1967:			
Korean broadcasts.....	715	357	30
Chinese broadcasts.....	104	52	
Subtotal.....	819	409	30
1968:			
Korean broadcasts.....	2,282	1,048	40
Chinese broadcasts.....	301	150	30
Subtotal.....	2,583	1,199	10
1969:			
Korean broadcasts.....	2,555	1,748	
Chinese broadcasts.....	365	182	30
Subtotal.....	2,920	1,930	30
1970:			
Korean broadcasts.....	2,555	1,916	15
Chinese broadcasts.....	365	185	30
Vietnamese broadcasts.....	228	57	
Subtotal.....	3,148	2,158	45
Grand total.....	9,590	5,758	25

SPECIAL PROGRAMS OF RADIO OF FREE ASIA

"The great achievement of Armstrong, Aldrin, Collins and the space pioneers behind them is a story that belongs to all mankind. It is a crime against humanity that Communist press and radio have denied news of this triumph to nearly one billion people in Communist Asia."

This is a quotation from Radio of Free Asia's press release right after the historical moon landing. To shatter this news blackout, Radio of Free Asia devoted 450 Special Programs to bring every detail of the moon shot to the Mainland of China and North Korea. This activity was designated by Radio of Free Asia as "Apollo 11 Month."

This is one example of Radio of Free Asia's Special Programs. These are similar to a "task force" for Radio of Free Asia. When a special need arises in which ROFA wants to inform the people behind the Bamboo Curtain of some special or extraordinary event and when special material is available, Radio of Free Asia uses Special Programs broadcast over the Radio of Free Asia system.

When the Communist world launched the spectacular world wide propaganda campaign to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, Radio of Free Asia immediately took action to counter the propaganda of Communism, by serializing the powerful book, "Worker's Paradise Lost" by Eugene Lyons. This book is a balance sheet of failure of Communism for 50 years.

When Svetlana Stalin, daughter of Josef Stalin made her dramatic escape to freedom, Radio of Free Asia brought her testimony to the millions of Asians who would never have known of this fact, otherwise.

When the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower passed away, Radio of Free Asia programmed America's greatness in pursuit of freedom. This was embodied in the life of the President and this Special Program was entitled, "A Portrait of an American Hero."

Radio of Free Asia values interview programs with those international figures who have experienced both life under Communism and the value of freedom. ROFA calls these Special Programs "Freedom Interviews." Who can explain and

testify to the evils of Communism better than the people who have defected from behind the Iron Curtain and the Bamboo Curtain and who have been victims of Communism themselves?

Radio of Free Asia interviews Red Refugees and defectors from Communist tyranny; those who have bitterly tasted the yoke of Communism and who were the victims of tyrannical masters and who narrowly escape and now live in freedom. Men from Russian slave campus . . . freedom fighters in Hungary . . . refugees from Tibet and Mongolia . . . a displaced school teacher from Czechoslovakia . . . an escaped musician from Red China . . . a pastor from the Rumanian underground church . . . a former Red Espionage agent from North Korea . . . and many others.

All these come under the Special Programs of Radio of Free Asia. Indeed, it is the "task force" of Radio of Free Asia. In the last five years, Radio of Free Asia broadcast a total of 47 such Special Programs in varying lengths. Some programs were serialized for as many as six months, while some were covered in a single day broadcast.

The following are some of the highlights of these Special Programs of Radio of Free Asia.

(1) "Flight to Freedom," September 15th to 22nd, 1967: The Dramatic Story of the Failure of Communism as told by Svetlana Stalin. The news of Svetlana's flight to freedom made headlines all over the world—EXCEPT behind the Bamboo Curtain. Radio of Free Asia made it possible for the oppressed millions to hear her story, which we entitled, "The Failure of Communism."

(2) "Worker's Paradise Lost," November 7th-21st, 1967: On November 7th, 1967, the Communists celebrated the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution with a world wide propaganda campaign. ROFA combatted it with a group of programs based on a serialization of Eugene Lyons' powerful book, "Worker's Paradise Lost" which effectively exploded all the myths the Communists were celebrating and trying to perpetuate.

(3) "Communism on Trial," March 21st to 28th, 1968: Radio of Free Asia gave first hand reports on the international "Communism on Trial" held on February 19th to 21st, 1968 at the Hall of Nations, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. Radio of Free Asia's microphone was there all three days and interviewed exclusively all prominent anti-Communist witnesses at the trial—then reported these truths on Special Programs on March 21st through March 28th, 1968 over Radio of Free Asia system.

(4) "To Murder a President," January 23, 1969: Interview with Lt. Sin Jo Kim, former North Korean armed commando who was sole survivor of a band of North Korean Communists who attempted to assassinate President Park of South Korea. Lt. Kim said in this interview, "I am even grateful to Red Premier Kim of North Korea for selecting me as a member of this horrible mission. It was through the failure of this mission that I obtained my freedom—a one in a million chance."

(5) "Eisenhower: Portrait of an American Hero," June 8th, 1969 to July 7th, 1969: This program featured the inspiring life story of the late General Dwight D. Eisenhower and his lifelong crusade for truth and freedom, his valor and courage to defend America and the American values of freedom and democracy.

(6) "Man on the Moon," August 2nd to August 31st, 1969: The achievements of the U.S. Space program, "Man on the Moon." The success of the U.S. space program, especially the Apollo projects was vividly conveyed to the uninformed people behind the Bamboo Curtain. This remarkable achievement was not only a success for the U.S., but also a triumph for all mankind. This was repeatedly broadcast into Red China which was totally blacked out during Apollo 11 landing on the moon.

(7) "The War of North Korean Aggression," January 1, 1970 to June 30th, 1970: This Special Program commemorated the 20th anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean War in which 30 thousand Americans died and thousands of Americans were wounded. Radio of Free Asia broadcast into North Korea a complete factual account of how and why the Communists started this war in 1950 and were completely responsible for the crimes and atrocities which followed. ROFA included the capture of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, the shooting down of the U.S. reconnaissance plane and the killing of all the crew.

(8) "Lenin's 100th Birthday—A day of mourning for the victims of Communism," April 24th, 1970: In the U.S., the United States Communist Party designed an unprecedented youth movement under the guise of peace which was motivated by the philosophy advocated by Lenin. The object of this well conceived and professional program was to disclose to the victims of Com-

munism themselves, the complete failure as a system of economics and government.

(9) "Life under Communism as compared with life in the Free World," June 15th, 1970 to June 19, 1970: These Special Programs were based on special interviews with Dae Jim Kang, former North Korean espionage agent who defected to freedom. He tells the people of North Korea and Red China what he found outside the "bamboo curtain" and he movingly explains why when ordered to return to the North—he chose Freedom instead!

#### FUTURE PLANS

Ten thousand programs have been broadcast in 6,000 hours of broadcast time. But much remains to be done. The future holds the key to completely fulfilling our commitment as an independent citizens' broadcasting system reaching the millions of fellow human beings behind the bamboo curtain in Asia.

Listed here are three projects and plans for future developments:

(1) Leasing Air Time in Other Localities: Radio of Free Asia has been leasing air time from the Korean Broadcasting System (KBS) in Seoul, Korea. Seoul is a strategic point in Asia and KBS's 500 kilowatt transmitters and their short wave facilities have been serving the purpose. But that is not enough.

In order to cover the entire area of Red Asia, Radio of Free Asia will lease other transmitters in different locations in Asia. This will enable ROFA to broadcast its programs with greater impact on larger numbers of listeners.

(2) Construction of Radio of Free Asia Transmitters: Radio of Free Asia's ultimate goal is to broadcast *around the clock*. This around the clock operation is the key to our total accomplishment of ROFA's objectives. The only way for ROFA to achieve this goal is for ROFA to own its independent transmitters.

Toward this end, ROFA is planning to build both 100 kilowatt short wave transmitters with multi-frequencies that will enable ROFA to pinpoint various targets in Asia and 100 kilowatt medium wave transmitters with directional antenna which will be able to target the entire North Korea and a part of Manchuria.

(3) Library and Research Center: ROFA emphasizes quality in programming. Knowledge of both the free world and the Communist world are vital and important for the quality programming of Radio of Free Asia. In the future, Radio of Free Asia will have a library and research center on broadcasting in Asia. This will give all the necessary information for the quality productions for ROFA programs under the stimuli of unbiased knowledge and truth. This library and research center will also provide other academic communities and other research organizations with reference material for their studies.

#### RADIO OF FREE ASIA

##### RADIO OF FREE ASIA BROADCASTS ON THE AMERICAN PRISONER OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION ISSUE IN NORTH VIETNAM

No voice is stronger than the voice of humanity. No voice carries farther than one broadcast by radio. Every week, voices carrying the moving story of Americans' rising concern over North Vietnamese treatment of our POWs and MIAs is now being broadcast over Radio of Free Asia directly to the North Vietnamese.

The programs to North Vietnam in Vietnamese language began on September 9th, 1970 from facilities which Radio of Free Asia leases for this purpose in Seoul, Korea. These programs are broadcast daily at the prime Asian time of 8 A.M. over two broadcast short wave frequencies 9.640 and 15.430 megacycles. From June 1st, 1971, these Vietnamese programs are beamed from closer transmitters located in Manila, The Philippines in short wave frequencies of 9.505 Megahertz.

Hanoi's leaders may refuse a petition sent to them through the mails; they may turn back the wives of American POWs and MIAs who travel to Paris to seek information about their husbands; but they cannot stop radio broadcasts from getting through.

In addition to the broadcast service, Radio of Free Asia is conducting a petition campaign on behalf of POWs, in cooperation with the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia and the American Red Cross and already have transferred approximately 150,000 petitions.

Following are the aims and concepts and other policies of Radio of Free Asia's Vietnamese program on the POW issue and this petition campaign.

108

AIMS AND CONCEPTS

It is ROFA's purpose, through broadcasts day after day, to make the people of North Vietnam aware that the vast majority of Americans are united on the issue of POWs/MIAs; that world opinion is against Hanoi on their refusal to give us a full list of POWs and to permit Red Cross inspection of their POW camps; and that they have nothing to gain by refusing to adhere to the Geneva Convention except condemnation by world public opinion.

P  
E  
T  
I  
T  
I  
O  
N

His Excellency Pham Van Dong, Premier  
Democratic Republic of Vietnam  
Hanoi, North Vietnam

Premier Pham Van Dong:

As concerned United States citizens we are joining Radio of Free Asia's appeal to your humanity and that of your nation in regard to our prisoners of war and our men missing in action:

*In the name of humanity...* RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for Hanoi to disclose the names of all POW's it holds, and to urge the National Liberation Front and the Pathet Lao to do the same.

*In the name of humanity...* RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for the assurance of proper detention facilities, food and medical care of the POW's.

*In the name of humanity...* RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for unhampered correspondence with their families.

*In the name of humanity...* RADIO OF FREE

ASIA calls for repatriation of sick or wounded who might not survive captivity.

*In the name of humanity...* RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for the International Red Cross or International Control Commission to be permitted to inspect the prison camps in North Vietnam as has been done in the South.

*In the name of humanity...* RADIO OF FREE ASIA calls for, in short, an honoring by Hanoi of her legal obligations under the Geneva Convention which she signed in 1957.

Name

Address

City

State

Zip

(please print)

Name

Address

City

State

Zip

(If additional space is needed for more names, please use other side)

More than 1,600 U.S. men are missing or presumed captured... some 800 in North Vietnam, 500 in North Vietnamese or Vietcong hands in South Vietnam and 200 in Laos. These men, now out of combat, are entitled to humane treatment. Their wives and children have an inalienable right to know where they are and how they are.

We must not leave anything undone which can be done to help POW and MIA wives and their children in their quest for the information to which they are entitled.

Communicating the rising groundswell of protests to the North Vietnamese does get results. 80% of the mail that has come from our men in prison camps in North Vietnam has arrived since the American people began to demonstrate their indignation to Hanoi's leaders. This response shows that leaders in Hanoi listen to the pulse of the American people. It is the American people who must increase the pressure of American and of world opinion on Hanoi. The time has come to expand the people's crusade for information about and humane treatment for our POWs and MIAs, ROFA serves as a "Bridge of Truth" carrying information about this rising crusade to Hanoi.

Radio of Free Asia has committed itself to carry on its radio campaign in this humanitarian cause to increase pressure on Hanoi leaders to:

- (1) Release a full and complete list of American prisoners of war, and
- (2) Give American POWs the humane treatment to which they are entitled.

SCOPE OF ROFA'S VIETNAMESE PROGRAM ON POW ISSUE

Radio of Free Asia plans to continue broadcasting into North Vietnam in the Vietnamese language repeatedly on the following five (5) points:

1. True and factual American and world opinion on the prisoners-of-war/MIA issue with emphasis on the fact that holding and misusing American POWs by Hanoi is not to their advantage.
2. Programs on American sentiment and mood with stress on the fact that Americans may be divided on war issues, but are clearly and solidly united in their stand on the POW/MIA issue.
3. Repetition of the text of the Geneva Convention, covering rules on treatment of prisoners of war, to which Hanoi is one of the signatories.
4. Repeated programs on Radio of Free Asia's "Plea for Humanity."
5. The names of North Vietnamese prisoners of war in the South when these names can be officially obtained.

GUIDE LINE ON ROFA'S VIETNAMESE PROGRAM ON POW ISSUE

- (1) A program staff at ROFA headquarters, Washington, D.C. produces the material. It is voiced in Vietnamese and tape-recorded here and sent to Korea for broadcast.
- (2) ROFA produced one program a week, but to gain maximum penetration the program is broadcast daily at the prime Asian time over three broadcast short wave frequencies. This same program is repeated every day of the week at the same hour.
- (3) Each program reports actions and statements which express Americans and foreign nationals deep humane concern for prisoners of war. They put pressure on leaders in Hanoi to abide by conditions of the Geneva Convention for the humane treatment of prisoners and for prompt reporting of the names of POWs/MIAs through the proper international body.
- (4) In the future, ROFA plans to strengthen its broadcasting service to North Vietnam by leasing medium wave transmitters in South East Asia. With these new facilities ROFA will be able to create literally a barrage of broadcasts to shatter the monopoly of information Hanoi leaders try to maintain in the areas they control.

RADIO OF FREE ASIA'S PETITION CAMPAIGN ON BEHALF OF POWS

ROFA broadcasts in Vietnamese on behalf of the American POWs/MIAs is the primary action of the campaign. A second and vitally important part of this effort has been the launching of a special petition campaign to Hanoi.

*The petition campaign serves two distinct purposes:* (1) By contacting millions of Americans through this campaign, ROFA can further arouse the American conscience and enlighten American public to a greater awareness of the plight of the American POW. This will eventually lead to stronger American as well as stronger world opinion for more pressure on Hanoi;

(2) By collecting and transmitting hundreds of thousands of these signed petitions by concerned Americans to Hanoi representatives in Paris, ROFA can apply substantial pressure upon Hanoi for their speedy release of the American POWs.

Many people express doubt as to the wisdom of launching this petition campaign, because of Hanoi's past refusal to accept petitions. Even so, ROFA feels strongly about the effectiveness on two counts. First, petitions by the millions will create a visual monument of the indignation of the American public and become a visible symbol of Hanoi's cruelty and inhumanity. Secondly, by doing our utmost we are letting our men in captivity and their families know that they will never be forgotten. The petitions will be a visible symbol of true brotherhood and comradeship and will present comfort to those suffering families. We are with them, and will fight it through, until they have their loved ones.

In this petition campaign, ROFA coordinates its efforts with the National League of Families of American prisoners and Missing in South East Asia and the American Red Cross.

RADIO OF FREE ASIA ADVISORY COUNCIL

U.S. SENATORS

Sen. Gordon Allott	Sen. Winston L. Prouty
Sen. Howard H. Baker	Sen. William Proxmire
Sen. Henry L. Bellmon	Sen. Hugh Scott
Sen. Paul J. Fannin	Sen. John J. Sparkman
Sen. Hiram L. Fong	Sen. Ted Stevens
Sen. Thomas J. McIntyre	Sen. John G. Tower
Sen. Jack Miller	Sen. Milton R. Young
Sen. Karl E. Mundt	

U.S. CONGRESSMEN

Speaker Carl Albert	Rep. Charles S. Gubser
Rep. Jackson E. Betts	Rep. Lawrence J. Hogan
Rep. Hale Boggs	Rep. John E. Hunt
Rep. John Brademas	Rep. Harold T. Johnson
Rep. Elford A. Cederberg	Rep. Charles Raper Jonas
Rep. Don H. Clausen	Rep. Robert McClory
Rep. James C. Cleveland	Rep. William S. Mailliard
Rep. Harold R. Collier	Rep. Robert D. Price
Rep. Dominick V. Daniels	Rep. Albert H. Quie
Rep. John H. Dent	Rep. Henry P. Smith, III
Rep. Edwin W. Edwards	Rep. M. Gene Snyder
Rep. James G. Fulton	Rep. William B. Widnall
Rep. Richard Fulton	Rep. Charles E. Wiggins

STATE GOVERNORS

Gov. John A. Burns, Hawaii	Gov. John A. Love, Colorado
Gov. Melvin H. Evans, Virgin Islands	Gov. Tom McCall, Oregon
Gov. Luis A. Ferre, Puerto Rico	Gov. John J. McKeithen, Louisiana
Gov. Stanley K. Hathaway, Wyoming	Gov. William G. Milliken, Michigan

DISTINGUISHED AMERICANS

Miss Edie Adams	Hon. Donald E. Lukens
Col. William A. Anders	Colin G. Male
Desi Arnaz	Hon. Catherine May
Miss Nadine Conner	Hon. Keith H. Miller
Hon. William C. Cramer	Miss Terry Moore
Bing Crosby	Miss Agnes Moorhead
Bob Crosby	Hon. George Murphy
Hon. John Dempsey	Jack W. Nicklaus
Don De Fore	Miss Jane Powell
Miss Til Dieterle	Phil Rizzuto
Miss Phyllis Diller	Hon. Winthrop Rockefeller
Mike Douglass	Cesar Romero
Mark Evans	Hon. Richard L. Roudebush
Miss Connie Francis	Hon. Don Samuelson
Hon. Samuel N. Friedel	Hon. Armistead I. Selden, Jr.
William G. Harley	Dean Smith
Hon. A. Sydney Herlong, Jr.	Sam Snead
Miss Hildegard	Robert Stack
George Jessel	Lowell Thomas
Murray the "K"	John Unitas
Sammy Kaye	Vincent T. Wasilewski
Hon. Thomas S. Kleppe	Johnny Weismuller
Hon. Harold LeVander	Roger Williams
Jerry Lewis	

SENATORS, CONGRESSMEN AND GOVERNORS WHO, THOUGH NOT ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE, HAVE ISSUED STATEMENTS SUPPORTING RADIO OF FREE ASIA

SENATORS

Wallace F. Bennett (R. Utah)	Edward J. Gurney (R. Fla.)
Allan Bible (D. Nev.)	Clifford P. Hansen (R. Wyo.)
J. Caleb Boggs (R. Del.)	Ernest F. Hollings (D. S. Car.)
Harry F. Byrd, Jr. (D. Va.)	Roman L. Hruska (R. Nebr.)
Robert C. Byrd (D. W. Va.)	Warren G. Magnuson (D. Wash.)
Howard W. Cannon (D. Nev.)	Joseph M. Montoya (D. N. Mex.)
Clifford P. Case (R. N.J.)	John O. Pastore (D. R.I.)
Norris Cotton (R. New H.)	Charles H. Percy (R. Ill.)
Peter H. Dominick (R. Colo.)	William B. Saxbe (R. Ohio)
James O. Eastland (D. Miss.)	John C. Stennis (D. Miss.)
Barry Goldwater (R. Ariz.)	Herman E. Talmadge (D. Ga.)
Robert P. Griffin (R. Mich.)	Strom Thurmond (R. S. Car.)

CONGRESSMEN

John M. Ashbrook (R. Ohio)	John J. Duncan (R. Tenn.)
Alphonzo Bell (R. Calif.)	Edward A. Garmatz (D. Md.)
Ben B. Blackburn (R. Ga.)	Carleton J. King (R. N.Y.)
Edward P. Boland (D. Mass.)	George P. Miller (D. Calif.)
William S. Broomfield (R. Mich.)	Alexander Pirnie (R. N.Y.)
James T. Broyhill (R. N. Car.)	W. R. Poage (D. Tex.)
Joel T. Broyhill (R. Va.)	Sam Steiger (R. Ariz.)
John H. Buchanan, Jr. (R. Ala.)	Joe D. Waggoner (D. La.)
William M. Colmer (D. Miss.)	Clement J. Zablocki (D. Wisc.)
John D. Dingell (D. Mich.)	

GOVERNORS

Robert Docking (D. Kans.)	Linwood Holton (R. Va.)
John M. Haydon (R. Am. Samoa)	Richard B. Ogilvie (R. Ill.)

(Additional material provided is on file with the committee.)

The CHAIRMAN. They are apparently continuing to solicit funds; are they not? They are still soliciting tax-deductible funds from Americans on the same idea that they are going to save us from communism.

It is a very appealing subject, but it also would seem to me that what they are saying is directly contrary to the announced policy of this Government. Wouldn't you say it is contrary if that is what they are doing?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, since I do not know what they are doing, I just would prefer not to comment.

The CHAIRMAN. I will ask it as a hypothetical question, but you need not answer it.

VIEWS OF ADVISORY COMMISSIONS ON INFORMATION AND CULTURAL EXCHANGES

When this legislation was being formulated, did anyone in your shop in the State Department consult with the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information? Did you consult?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I did not personally.

The CHAIRMAN. Did anyone in your shop consult?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. If I could merely inquire—they are informed, I am told, through USIA, which is the normal liaison with them.

The CHAIRMAN. They were not consulted. Their opinion was not requested?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. If they had any opinion to give, apparently they did not volunteer it.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the Advisory Commission on Cultural Exchanges consulted and were its views requested?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Neither of these advisory commissions has recommended this bill, have they?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, I would assume not, if they were not consulted.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of your announced purposes, which are information and better relations, why do you not think the Commission on Cultural Exchanges should have been consulted to see what they thought about it?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, cultural exchanges are usually thought to refer to another kind of activity than radiobroadcasting. But—

The CHAIRMAN. Do you approve of the cultural exchange program?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I certainly do.

#### REQUESTED AMOUNT AND FUNDING OF CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

The CHAIRMAN. I notice the amount you are requesting is more than that devoted to the cultural exchange program, although it has been in existence over 20 years. Is the amount not more than is currently being supplied by the Federal Government for the support of the cultural exchange program?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I believe that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what the amount for the cultural exchange is?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I do not have the figure.

The CHAIRMAN. It is \$36 million. I think it was down to \$31 million the year before last and it is now \$36 million. I had the figures here a moment ago. It does not matter exactly, but this request is more.

Don't you think if you obtained this kind of money it would be better to add it to the cultural exchange program, which is an established organization?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, the two activities are entirely different. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the State Department has tried for many years to improve its cultural affairs budget. It has not been for lack of trying.

The CHAIRMAN. I have the figures here. For fiscal 1971, the cultural exchange program funding was approximately \$36,950,000; fiscal 1970, \$32,300,000; fiscal 1969, \$31,425,000; fiscal 1968, \$45 million. In 1967 it apparently reached its peak of \$47 million. It was cut back from \$47 million to \$31 million and in 1971 it is now \$36 million.

The exchange program operates under formal agreements in roughly 50 countries. According to the committee records most ambassadors have agreed it is a beneficial program that does not contribute to the prolongation of the cold war.

However inaccurate you say the articles I put in the record are, I have never seen an article which indicated that the cultural exchange program has exacerbated the differences among various countries. As a matter of fact, one of the countries with whom we have

an agreement under the cultural exchange program is a Communist country.

I think I have put in the record all that I wished to.

Senator CASE. Just a comment or two.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, certainly.

#### DISTINCTION BETWEEN AMERICAN COUNCIL AND PAST OPERATION

Senator CASE. In my formal statement, which I included in the record without reading in full, I made strongly the points that the chairman has been emphasizing and with which I fully agree. I unequivocally support the elimination and termination of the CIA participation in these stations. That is my position. If legislation is necessary or would be helpful for that purpose, I would certainly cooperate in trying to develop the specific language. And I assume the intention of the administration is the same on that point. If I did not think so, I would not introduce the administration bill. I do not expect that either the administration or Congress should go on year after year just spending money for something it does not approve of. But the proposed American Council is a different kind of agency or instrumentality for the day-to-day operation of RFE and RL than existed in the past under CIA. I would like to make that distinction as to my conception of the American Council from the way RFE and RL were operated in the past.

#### ACTIVITY OF RFE AND RL HAS SERVED ITS DAY

The CHAIRMAN. I say to the Senator that it seems to me if there is any expectation of improvement of our relations with Russia, it seems to me this kind of activity has served its day. That expectation has certainly been aroused to a greater extent than usual by recent statements of the administration and I certainly hope those statements prove to be correct. I think to continue to try to stir up trouble in Eastern Europe and in Russia is contrary to the President's own policy.

This kind of activity is acceptable and common in wartime and even under conditions as they existed under Stalin, just as the continuation of large numbers of troops in Germany was proper at that time. It strikes me that if the President wants to move into a period of negotiation rather than confrontation he ought to quit confronting them with daily insults. I know he does not do it, but to allow an agency of the Government to do it seems to me contrary to the President's own announced purposes. Now that I see more clearly, I am not sure what is in the mind of the administration, but if I am going to support anything, it is going to be simply a public authorization of the continuation of RFE. We could at least stop RFE much more easily when and if we make an agreement with Russia that is at all significant. It won't come all at once. It will be a step if we make one significant agreement on arms. I would say that is a step toward improvement all along. We would not, I believe, continue to insult them daily, either by direct attacks or even the assumption that they are ignorant and deprived of all this wonderful news from the U.S.A.

NEED FOR RFE AND RL QUESTIONED

You have already pointed out that there are a number of other government agencies, German and French and others, who supply them with basic information. If they want to, they can subscribe to the AP and UP at reasonable costs. The cost is much less than jamming our broadcasts if they are really interested in news. So I do not see any real need for this kind of propaganda. This kind of propaganda is inconsistent with the objective of improving relations with a country. Many countries around the world may be just as "backwards," if I may use that word in quotes because I think in many ways they are not all that backward. But other than Voice of America, we do not set up special treatment operations like RFE for many countries.

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is just a question of being backward. I think it is legitimate and right for us to question, as Members of the Senate and as this Committee on Foreign Relations, whether instrumentalities of this sort should be permitted. My own point is that whatever goes on should be in the open.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not say they were backward.

Senator CASE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. But in justifying it, the administration is saying these poor people would be deprived of news and won't know what is going on in the world and that news ought to be supplied by the United States of America.

At the same time, there are a number of other government broadcasts in Europe which are not quite as antagonistic in attitude, supplying news. The witness stated they were doing that. I did not say the Senator said that.

Senator CASE. No, I do accept that a country which is under centralized control, such as the Soviet Union and other countries in Eastern Europe, do find that their information is limited to that which the government for the time being wishes to allow the people to have and that this presents a different situation from that in the United States, or where, however much the government would like to propagandize or use the media for its own benefit and however much it wishes to withhold information, there are great differences.

Nevertheless, the chairman raises a legitimate question in whether the U.S. Government should finance radio stations such as RFE and RL.

My own feeling is that up to now it has probably been more useful than not. Therefore, I have concentrated my efforts in making RFE and RL as legitimate and as open as possible, so that the American people could know what we are doing as do the governments of the countries in which these activities take place.

LACK OF BROADCASTING TO OTHER COUNTRIES WITH CONTROLLED PRESS

The CHAIRMAN. You prompt me to observe that we do not feel the same necessity to broadcast the news into Greece. Do we have any programs directed at Greece that inform them of the kind of policies that their government is following, how many people are tortured, put in jail. We do not have such programs in Greece; do we?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Not that I know of, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do we have one for Spain?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I do not believe so.

The CHAIRMAN. Or for Brazil? They are deprived of a free press. Their press is controlled. Certainly the Greek press is completely controlled. Those who have not toed the line have either been imprisoned or they have fled the country.

Senator CASE. Very legitimate questions, and ones that we ought to consider, Mr. Chairman.

#### PERPETUATION OF DISAVOWED POLICY SUGGESTED

The CHAIRMAN. This, it seems to me, is designed to perpetuate a policy which I thought the President has disavowed, which is to overthrow the Russian Government. I think they would reconcile themselves to its reasonable permanence.

Do you have anything you would like to say, Mr. Hillenbrand?

#### PRESENT PERFORMANCE OF RADIOS

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, merely one or two final points. I do believe that merely to consider these radios as they presently operate as another element, a residual element of the cold war, is really to misconceive the way they presently perform. It is not a matter of merely substituting or providing substitutions for AP and what would be available through other radios. They perform a unique service which, I think, can be justified for a further period of time as a major western asset.

I have not bored you today with quotations from various newspaper articles, European articles, and so on, as well as things that have been said about these radios by various authors but, I think, the consensus is that they really have had an educative effect which is more than superficial over the last 10 or some years, and that they represent really a major factor in, perhaps, providing within the systems that operate in Eastern Europe a way for the citizenry to influence the practices of governments on the basis of accurate information, allowing for the fact that these are not democratic systems and, therefore, do not have institutions for the expression of public opinion. I think, therefore, during an interim period, a period of indefinite duration about which the Congress itself can decide, when the time has come, it should be continued on the basis that we have proposed. Such things as public fund raising and radio broadcasts and TV broadcasts in this country, if they are found unsuitable for the new institution well, that is a decision that will not be unacceptable to those who feel the continuance of the radios should be a primary goal. I think that is all I want to add, Mr. Chairman.

#### CIA'S AUTHORITY TO EDUCATE FOREIGN PEOPLE QUESTIONED

The CHAIRMAN. You prompt me to ask what authority the CIA has to educate, just educate, foreign people? Is it within their jurisdiction to undertake educational programs of the Russians, for example, or any other foreign people?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. To the degree that the U.S. Government feels it is appropriate to perform such a function——

The CHAIRMAN. The CIA is authorized by special act. I think it grows out of the National Security Act of 1947. I do not recall that there is any authority for an intelligence-gathering agency to undertake an educational program such as the cultural program which is authorized. I do not believe Congress, in authorizing the CIA, expected it to undertake the responsibility of educating other people on the facts of life in the educational, cultural, or artistic fields do you? I do not think that was contemplated nor involved in the basic organization for the CIA.

Was it not intended to gather information for the benefit of our Government in contrast to the cultural exchange or the USIA, which is a propaganda agency?

It seems to me that was the agency created by the Congress with the responsibility to inform, if you like, foreign people. I do not believe Congress ever intended that the CIA was to become another USIA or cultural program. Do you think it was, as far as the intent of the congressional authorization for this activity?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, this has a long history, and if you are interested in going into the history of how it was developed, I would be very happy to do that as I said, in an executive session, where we can be as frank as you wish.

#### CIA AUTHORITY FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IN RUSSIA REQUESTED

The CHAIRMAN. I would be interested if you would present to this committee what you believe to be the authority granted by Congress for the CIA to undertake an educational program in Russia. I think it would be very interesting for us. Or are you saying that as Commander in Chief, the President can engage in any kind of activity he likes for the protection of his troops. Is that the authority you are relying on? If so, I think it would be interesting for the Congress to know that.

Would you provide what you believe to be the authority for the CIA to conduct its activities? You can do it in executive session if you would like or in a classified document.

#### JUSTIFICATION FOR WITHHOLDING INFORMATION REQUESTED

After you have consulted the Department, would you give me a further letter as to whether or not you will supply the information requested on the CIA and also this matter of Berlin. I, personally, am not willing to accept the view that what we are receiving is compensation in accordance with the agreement for the maintenance of our troops in Berlin is none of our business. It is not directly connected with this legislation, but it is a matter we have had up. I would like to have a further letter containing your justification for withholding that kind of information.

#### STATE DEPARTMENT'S RELUCTANCE TO SUPPLY INFORMATION

I frankly end up by saying that the attitude on the part of the Department of State not to give this committee information to which we

think we are entitled is a relatively new one. I do not recall the Department of State until the last year or two being so reluctant to supply information.

Of course, this is one way of completely negating any influence that the Congress and the Senate may have on our foreign operations.

Why do you think the Department has developed this weakness for secrecy? Do you think the world is in such bad shape that you cannot communicate with the Congress?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I think we make a strong effort to communicate with the Congress. And I think in this particular context, certainly if you wish we will be able to provide you in an executive session all that you want in the way of information about the past facts.

The CHAIRMAN. And on Berlin?

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, you mean on the Berlin occupation costs, budget?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. As I said, this matter is under consideration in the administration. It is not purely a State Department responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The GAO said you were the man who refused the information.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. Well, I signed the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. I assumed you were the spokesman.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. I accepted the responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. For the Department. All right.

Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

The next witness is Mr. Paul Bartlett, former president of Radio New York World Wide, Inc., New York.

#### STATEMENT OF PAUL BARTLETT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, before going on to my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to read in part but not in full, I would like to submit it for the record in full.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so, certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. What I would like to do, is to be heard on some of the issues which have been brought up here today and which, I understood, would not be brought up and to which I could not speak in the prepared statement and, with your permission, I would like to do the much harder job of reading the beginning portions of the statement and go through the other issues which have been mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. You do as you please. It is only four pages. If you do not wish to read it, it will be in the record.

Mr. BARTLETT. I can read it entirely, then, if you are willing.

The CHAIRMAN. You do as you please.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is easier for me to read it all than go on with additional remarks, if that is permissible.

#### RADIO NEW YORK WORLD WIDE

The CHAIRMAN. Would you at the beginning explain what Radio New York World Wide is. I had not heard of it before. What is it?

Mr. BARTLETT. Radio New York World Wide is a private corpora-

tion which is, in fact, owned by the Mormon Church, but it has been sold recently—or negotiations are underway for its sale. So it may not still be owned by the Mormon Church, but it was owned by them until recently.

It is a private shortwave station. It operates a private shortwave station called WNYW in New York. It broadcasts to Europe, Africa, and South America in the shortwave bands. It is a purely commercial station. It is an international affiliate of the CBS radio network, carries CBS news, U.S. stock market reports, news, music, entertainment, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it a profitmaking organization?

Mr. BARTLETT. That was its intention, sir, but that is not the way it turned out. It has been quite unprofitable for some years and, in fact, it is the oldest of all the private shortwave stations. When the Office of War Information returned the shortwave stations to their original owners after the war, very few of them elected to keep the stations because they were unprofitable; so NBC, Westinghouse, and other stations went into the Voice of America, and one or two private ones, such as Radio New York World Wide, Inc., remained outside.

The CHAIRMAN. And belonged to the Mormon Church?

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, it did not originally belong to the Mormon Church. Originally it belonged to a man in Boston who was well known, and whom I knew, but whose name skips me at the moment, and then it was owned by Metromedia in New York and they subsequently sold it to the Mormon Church, and the Mormon Church is now selling it to someone else.

The CHAIRMAN. When did the Mormon Church acquire it?

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, I cannot give you the exact date, but I think—

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately.

Mr. BARTLETT. About 1966 or 1967.

The CHAIRMAN. Very recently.

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, yes; it might have been a year earlier, but that is about right.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it used primarily for educational purposes of the church?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; very little church broadcasting was done over that station. As a matter of fact, the church, of which I am not a member, made it clear to me when I undertook to reorganize it that they did not want to use it as a propaganda arm. They said, "We believe in the free enterprise system, the American system. We believe there should be private stations in the international business and not just Government stations, and although we sustained a \$1 million a year loss, or something like that we would like to keep this thing alive as long as we can." And that is what they do.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, proceed.

#### REPRESENTATION AND BACKGROUND OF WITNESS

Mr. BARTLETT. My name is Paul Bartlett, and I reside in Fresno, Calif., where I formerly owned radio and television stations.

I do not appear here today in behalf of any government agency, or of any private or public corporation, association, or other entity, but solely as a private citizen who has been both a student and a prac-

itioner of international broadcasting and is deeply interested in the legislation under discussion today.

May I put in parenthetically, Mr. Chairman, especially in view of the question, Radio New York World Wide or its owners have no knowledge of my appearance here today, and I do not represent them in any way whatsoever.

Because it is somewhat unusual for a private citizen "without portfolio" to participate in proceedings such as these, in which he can have no personal or financial interest, I want to explain the background which brings me here.

During the 11 years since I sold my California stations I have spent a good deal of time traveling and living outside the United States. Over these years I have undertaken to learn what I could of broadcasting in other countries, and of our own Government's extensive broadcasting activities overseas. As a result, I became convinced that sweeping changes are urgently needed in many of the Government's broadcasting efforts, some of which have been little changed in the last 20 years, and are eligible for retirement.

During 1968 I became president of Radio New York World Wide, Inc., which operates one of the two or three remaining privately owned international broadcasting stations in this country and spent a little over a year reorganizing the company's activities and redirecting its efforts. During this temporary employment I expanded my contacts both at home and abroad and became still more dedicated to the belief that our country can and must improve its international broadcasting services.

Over the last 2 years I have been almost entirely engaged in trying to hasten the needed changes by talking to Members of the Senate and House, to committee staff people, to White House aides, the Advisory Committee on Information, and others. Senator Cranston, from my own State, has been especially helpful in my efforts because of his own personal experiences directing the foreign-language broadcasts of the OWI during World War II, and it is at his urging that I presume on your time today.

#### CHANGE IN FUNDING REPRESENTS IMPORTANT FIRST STEP

The bills introduced by Senator Case and Congressman Reid seeking to change the funding of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty from covert to overt status represent a critically important first step in improving the credibility and quality of these two German-based operations which are so little known to the American public, but which greatly affect our relations with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

Senator Case's statement that RFE and Radio Liberty are funded by the CIA did not come as a surprise to the international broadcast community. At most, it served to confirm what most of us in the field had assumed, but did not know. It came as still less of a surprise to people in the Soviet-dominated areas who had long been told by their governments that these were "pirate" stations financed by the United States, and were not "private" as they had claimed to be.

The shock was felt here at home where our fellow countrymen had been led to believe that Radio Free Europe was financed by dimes

from schoolchildren and voluntary gifts from concerned citizens anxious to keep truth alive behind the Iron Curtain. The fact is that the truth about RFE and Radio Liberty was long overdue on this side of the Iron Curtain and we are all indebted to Senator Case and Congressman Reid for their revelation.

#### PROPOSED PRIVATE-PUBLIC CORPORATION

It is my understanding from press reports and from information given me by Senator Case's office that the administration is proposing that the Congress charter and fund a "private-public" corporation which would in turn fund and control Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty under the general direction of the State Department. Although I understand that this general approach is acceptable to Senator Case and Congressman Reid, I have no accurate knowledge of the details of the administration proposal, and I must therefore limit myself to some general observations which seem pertinent.

It seems to me that the new private-public corporation which is to be proposed could be enormously useful in improving the whole broad spectrum of broadcasting activities now being conducted with Government funds, some of which are excessively wasteful, outdated, or counterproductive and overdue for radical change or for scrapping outright. None of these opportunities will exist unless the corporation's charter is drawn broadly enough to permit real, meaningful action.

I do not suggest that any other Government broadcasting be placed under the proposed corporation at this time, or that any specific plans be made now for including a given operation in the future. I even hope some will be left out or discontinued, but this may be a vain hope since no plumber ever seems to be able to turn the Government faucet off once the money starts to flow.

#### HOW NEW CORPORATION COULD BE USED

But I would like to give some hint as to how the new corporation could be used in the national interest if it is chartered in a way which will permit its broad and imaginative use.

Someday such a corporation might, for example, undertake some of the Pentagon's overseas broadcasting in noncombat areas. Whether or not we have troop reductions in Europe, it may not always be prudent or even possible to continue the operation of the 30 broadcasting stations the Army now has in Germany. Reduced or entirely different operations might be established by the new corporation.

#### COMPLICATIONS AGAINST WHICH WE NEED TO GUARD

At the same time I can see some vexing complications against which we need to guard. For example, heretofore the State Department has been able to disavow Radio Free Europe and Liberty because they were so-called private companies. Presumably this will no longer be possible and there are likely to be times when the new corporation under the guidance of the State Department may be out of step with the Voice of America under the U.S. Information Agency.

In the recent past, differences between State and USIA were only domestic matters, but under the new arrangement the Government

might be in the position of talking out of both sides of its mouth at the same time, and over the international airways. This is something crucial and obvious which I shall not belabor here.

I think there is another danger to which we should be alert. I refer to the possibility that the new "private-public" corporation may, in fact, be neither private nor public, but simply a means of paying for RFE and Liberty out of a coat pocket that is visible instead of one sewn into the lining.

The directors of the new corporation need and deserve to be substantially more than new front men. They should be charged with full life-or-death responsibility for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. They must not be a mere conduit designed to give rigid perpetuity to practices of the past.

The final bill which creates the new Corporation needs to be enabling legislation in the philosophical as well as the technical sense. It could bring to American overseas media similar to those which Comsat has brought to other communications.

But if the Corporation fails to bring together the best of private and Government expertise, both harnessed to work together in the national interest, the country will have been shortchanged.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to make some additional remarks in view of the testimony this morning.

#### IMPLICATIONS OF ADOPTING PROPOSED LEGISLATION WITHOUT SPECIFIC SAFEGUARDS

I recognize that the committee is concerned here today only with the method by which RFE and Liberty should be funded and not with the merits of these organizations themselves. At the same time, I am deeply disturbed over some of the implications of adopting either the Case bill or the administration's Corporation without some very specific safeguards, for the adoption of either proposal seems to assume without any further question, that both these services are worth the \$36 million or more they cost every year.

It seems to me that when we talk about, only about, the funding of these stations we are really talking about a small part of the big iceberg floating in the most troubled and dangerous seas through which the American ship of state has to sail.

Our foreign relations with the Soviets and with other eastern bloc countries are all affected by what amounts virtually to verbal warfare which RFE and Radio Liberty conduct day and night against these countries, countries whose governments may displease us, but with whom we must live in peace on this ever smaller planet.

RFE and Liberty operations also affect the rapprochement which Bonn seeks to achieve with her neighbors. The mere existence of these Munich-based stations can complicate our own relations with the vital West German European heartland.

We may well wonder if RFE and Liberty have become unwelcome guests. Therefore, I would hope that nothing which results from any legislation proposed would serve to make RFE and Liberty immune from the most searching scrutiny this committee could possibly give these aging cold war stalwarts.

Unfortunately, Government-funded operations often end up really being evaluated by the very people who run them. If by the adoption of the Case bill the Congress will be able to undertake the overdue examination of the effectiveness and the propriety of RFE and Liberty, examination which has hitherto been hindered by their private and secret nature, or if the Corporation is so constituted so as to be freely able to conduct an examination in behalf of the Congress, real progress will have been made.

I also suspect a good deal of international hard feelings will have been eliminated and some hard money saved.

If, on the other hand, either the Case bill or the administration's new Corporation is turned into a fence which would frustrate the scrutiny of this committee, we may well end up having a still larger surplus of international ill will. Some might be created by other organizations already in existence which think they, too, should have Federal funds, and some by new organizations which may end up being born with one hand already in the Government till.

As for credibility, it seems to me that the credibility, a priceless virtue, of RFE and Liberty, cannot be maintained in their present form. Their lack of credibility comes only in part from the method by which they have been founded. It also stems from the nature of their operation and from the fact of their existence.

It seems to me that credibility will come only when they have been changed into entirely new and different organizations, and I hope that legislation being considered here today will enable the necessary changes to be made before another 20 years have passed.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Bartlett. I thought you made some very pertinent statements.

#### HOW WOULD STATE DEPARTMENT AND VOA POLICY DIFFER?

How would State Department policy differ generally from the policy of the VOA? Wouldn't it be the same? The VOA is subject to policy guidance from the State Department.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, there has been some feeling in the past that the VOA and the State Department policy have not always been identical, although we should expect that to be the case. This statement was written, as you well know, before I saw the true nature of the proposal which has been made here today.

I do not see how, to answer your question in the broadest terms, the Government can possibly be divorced from this Corporation. It is neither public nor private. It is a Government Corporation which is called private.

The CHAIRMAN. Your statement was prepared before you saw this?

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh yes, I asked to be furnished with an advance copy of the bill, but it was not possible for me to receive it.

#### U.S. ARMY BROADCASTING STATIONS IN GERMANY

The CHAIRMAN. You state that the Army maintains 30 broadcasting stations in Germany at the present time.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You know that?

Mr. BARTLETT. Well——

The CHAIRMAN. I did not know it. That is why I asked you.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would say it is 30 or 29 or 31.

The CHAIRMAN. It is about 30.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Wouldn't that seem to be ample to get their message across?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, it has always seemed to me that it is not only ample, but it is rather outrageous that a government which has difficulty funding public television and would not allow the Commerce Department or the Agriculture Department to run a radio network would let the Pentagon operate a worldwide system.

The CHAIRMAN. It strikes me that way, too. I really did not know they had that many broadcasting stations.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is only in Germany now.

The CHAIRMAN. I said in Germany.

#### U.S. ARMY BROADCASTS STATIONS WORLDWIDE

How many—do you happen to know how many—they have worldwide?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; I do not. Of course, it must be said many of those they have worldwide are in very small places like bases in Greenland and places of that nature, but they also have stations in Puerto Rico which is a little anomalous.

#### ATTITUDE OF WEST GERMAN GOVERNMENT

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any information at all about the attitude of the Government of West Germany toward the continuation of RFE and RL?

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, I am not privy to any confidential information from the German Government. I did spend some time at Frankfurt talking to the editors of the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung last summer when we discussed what they thought the Government felt.

The CHAIRMAN. What did they think?

Mr. BARTLETT. They said that they felt that, perhaps, it was just as well for Germany to be able to say, "We didn't say it. It was the Americans over there who said it," and in that sense maybe RFE and Liberty perform some services to the Germans; that is, they can blame on the Americans what they would like to say but do not have to.

The CHAIRMAN. Since they licensed it and since it originates from their country, how can they avoid some responsibility for it?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think they can not, and I am sure that that has been touched on many times here this morning, and from the conversations I had with Radio Moscow last summer, they make no bones about it. They said they want to get those pirate operations out of West Germany and "we will move heaven and earth to do it."

#### VOA BROADCASTING CAPACITY

The CHAIRMAN. The VOA has the physical capacity to broadcast anywhere RFE and RL do; do they not?

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, basically, yes, although——

The CHAIRMAN. They have an enormously powerful transmitter down there in the Mediterranean as close to Moscow almost and all of Russia as RFE and RL; do they not?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; they do.

The CHAIRMAN. If they wanted to broadcast they could. They have the physical capacity there to do it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; except I think one would have to technically qualify to say they would allege some of their current antennas would have to be changed, matters of that kind, but they should be able to cover it.

#### EFFECT ON UNITED STATES OF DISCONTINUING RFE AND RL

The CHAIRMAN. How would the United States suffer if RFE and RL are simply discontinued?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I seriously doubt if it would suffer. But I know that my personal view as a private citizen is at variance with the view of some in very high places, and I really feel a little that I am overstating my competence in making such a remark.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not have to speak for them, but you do have experience. Your own view is all I expect you to tell us.

You made a very interesting statement when you said, "I even hope some will be left out and discontinued but this may be a vain hope since no plumber ever seems to be able to turn the government faucet off once the money starts to flow."

That statement alone shows you understand the Government, very well and I congratulate you on it. I only ask you that as a hypothetical question because I expect what you say is quite right. It will be impossible to turn the faucet off because there are too many people interested in keeping the faucet open. From your own private point of view, you do not think the Government of the United States would suffer if the faucet could be turned off?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all I want to know.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to stress I said no plumber seems to be able to. I think it is perfectly possible to turn the faucet off, and I hope somebody will.

The CHAIRMAN. If you could give me a good example of where it is done to a great extent, I would be interested.

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, may I make a statement?

The CHAIRMAN. I yield to Senator Case. He has the floor.

#### GETTING A HANDLE ON RFE-RL QUESTION

Senator CASE. I want to thank you very much for your testimony. It has been very helpful to me. One of the points that you make is that what we are doing here is moving in the direction of getting a handle on the RFE-RL question, so if they are undesirable they can be altered or terminated. That was one of my purposes in proposing my original legislation to bring the financing of RFE and RL out in the open.

Mr. BARTLETT. I think that is absolutely right, Senator, and that is why, as I say, I commend you and Congressman Reid for having

done that. I think you must get a handle on it. But what I am hesitant over the thought that just bringing it out into the open and then using any corporation or foundation or any other device as a funnel through which to pour millions of dollars into something which may or may not need to exist automatically. Just to pour the funds automatically concerns me a very great deal. I think these things are long overdue for serious reevaluation. All the government's international broadcasting facilities are.

Senator CASE. I want to make it very clear I agree completely with you.

I have nothing else, Mr. Chairman.

#### WITNESS'S VISIT TO RADIO MOSCOW

The CHAIRMAN. I am curious. What were you doing visiting Radio Moscow? What kind of a mission were you on there? You said you visited Radio Moscow.

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, I did. As I said earlier in the statement, after selling my stations I did what I could to learn about radio broadcasting in other countries.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they receive you cordially?

Mr. BARTLETT. After a good deal of difficulties. I wrote a letter first and said that I am an American citizen. I am not coming on official business. I simply have heard Radio Moscow, as I have heard other shortwave stations. Could I come and see it. And I didn't get any answer. So I asked one of the correspondents, I do not know whether it is Pravda or whoever, at the U.N. I looked one up and asked him how you get to see Radio Moscow, and after a long conversation in which he interrogated me on whether I wanted to write a book or whatever, he said he would try to arrange it. But he did not. When I was in Europe I sent him a telegram and said, "Do I get to go or not," and he sent me back the names and said, "Yes," and I was received at a tour of Radio Moscow and spent an hour and a half with one of the 11 committee members who control the broadcasting services of the Soviet. They were friendly and knowledgeable about our business, very, very knowledgeable.

The CHAIRMAN. They knew about RFE and RL, I guess?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes indeed they did. They said they hoped to drive them out of Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they consider their programs were being jammed when we broadcast on the same wave length that was allocated to them?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes. They accused us of jamming, and my own view is, however, that they jam a good deal more than we do.

#### DIFFERENCE IN UNITED STATES AND SOVIET JAMMING

But I would like to touch on a point since we are on jamming that you raised this morning, which I do not think is widely enough and well enough understood. The kind of jamming that we are doing with the big Munich transmitter is vastly different, in my opinion, very much worse than the kind of jamming that the Soviet Union is doing.

The CHAIRMAN. How is that?

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, the Soviet Union is following the policy of the czars, which is that Russians ought to hear what the Government thinks they ought to hear and, for that reason, they are jamming our services to try to keep VOA—not so much VOA—they worry now about RFE and Liberty—out of the Eastern Zone. They are trying to keep, to wall their people in, as it were, with the jamming.

Now, the jamming we are doing in Munich is very different. We are interfering with Radio Moscow in areas which Radio Moscow hopes to serve. It is very much as though somebody put a station on WTOP's frequency, so that the people out in Maryland could not hear WTOP. That is a little exaggeration, because that would be much too close, that is putting a station to interfere that close, but the transmitter that we operate in Munich causes interference over various areas of the western part of the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean within the Soviet Union itself?

Mr. BARTLETT. Certainly, and we do a very, very sophisticated type of jamming. I say this with firsthand knowledge because I visited the station.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not realize that in talking with Mr. Hillenbrand. He seems to think this was perfectly legitimate. We are then jamming their domestic programs.

Mr. BARTLETT. Correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Not just their foreign broadcasts, Mr. Bartlett.

Mr. BARTLETT. And we are doing it, I think, Mr. Chairman, in a very deceptive way. Marilyn Berger in her article covered it—you read the text in part—in which she said independent experts had said that it was jamming. Technically they put on, this Voice of America transmitter in Munich puts on programs in Russian and in English or that was the case last summer. I think there has been a change in the schedule recently. I do not know what it is now, but last summer they put on English and Russian, and during the Russian portion of the broadcasts they would transmit maybe 5, 6, 7, 10 minutes in Russian and then they would suddenly throw in at random odd English sentences that just seemed to be pulled out of a tape and thrown into this, and so the impression to anyone receiving interference via that station thinks well, there must be something wrong with the radio tonight, it just is not coming in too clear.

Now, the VOA claims according to published reports, that they are trying to reach people in the Eastern Zone and the Soviet Union, and that may well be, but it is also true they are doing abroad what the FCC will never permit anybody to do in this country, things which other people do not usually do.

The CHAIRMAN. You think Miss Berger's article is correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think it is entirely accurate.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought it was, too.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am sure it is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. You know it is true.

She usually is accurate; I think.

WITNESS' VIEWS CONCERNING TERMINATION OF RFE AND RL

I am not clear, but I believe you would favor the termination of RFE and RL now when you say you do not think their continua-

tion in itself is beneficial to the Government or that we would not suffer if we stopped it.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is a close approximation. I think I would put it slightly differently, temper it a little. I think I would say I believe they are not serving an adequate purpose, and that I believe we should do everything we can right now to make sure that they are, and if they are not—and not turning them off. I am not just saying categorically I think you should turn them off now.

NARROWNESS OF OPTIONS

The CHAIRMAN. We may not have the option to turn them off. The CIA is pretty well beyond the control of certainly this committee, if not the Congress. You know their appropriations are handled in such a way that most Members of the Congress, including me, do not know where they appear in the appropriations. This is a device that has been developed over the years. We run constantly into this secrecy business and classification. So the new legislation that would prohibit them from doing it might or might not be passed. Unless you give them what they want in the way of an alternative, they oppose any other legislation, such as turning off the spigot. They very well may prevail if it comes to a vote. I am talking about the House, because it is very difficult to find any legislation that is passed over there over the military opposition. So our options are very narrow. That is why I said I supported public authorization, as I told the Senator from New Jersey. I want to commend him, as you did, for bringing this matter out in the open when he first said he wanted this to be funded, if at all, in the public, general, proper and ordinary way, the way that we fund other activities in the open.

I did not mean by that, and I do not think the Senator understood that to mean, that I am all out for continuing this operation even in public, but certainly the great service rendered is to bring it out in public where we no longer deceive our own people. We do not deceive anybody else, but we deceive the American people about what is going on. I think the Senator deserves great credit for his proposal. How we will work out whether we should continue this kind of activity is another matter. I know the President has other things to think about, but he will find, if he has time to look into it, what has been done and is being done in the past 10 years is contrary to his presently announced policy with regard to Eastern Europe, especially Russia. So I do not think it would suffer especially from the discontinuance of this activity either, but I am not the final disposer of this. We sometimes have to accept some kind of compromise in order to get a little bit of something.

I do not know what will finally happen, but I am very glad your testimony has been given. It is very useful, coming from a man who is in the business and not subject to governmental direction. Thank you very much.

Do you have anything further that you would like to say?

126

WITNESS' QUALIFICATIONS CONCERNING RECOMMENDATIONS ON  
RF AND RFE

Mr. BARTLETT. One additional comment or two. First of all I do not want to just gratuitously say yes, turn them off because I do not think that I am well qualified enough to know for sure. I want to make that point.

The CHAIRMAN. We all speak only within our own competence of what we know and that is the best we can do.

OPERATION IS CONTRARY TO PRESIDENT'S CURRENT POLICY

Mr. BARTLETT. I think this operation is contrary to the President's current policy.

The CHAIRMAN. I do, too.

REASONS WHY RFE AND RL CONTINUE

Mr. BARTLETT. And I do not know why they are continued. But I suspect that they are continued for reasons above the CIA. I look on the CIA, whom I regard highly, as a necessary part of our Government operation, and people of integrity as having been given the job.

The CHAIRMAN. This is not really what they are expected to do. They have done what they were told at another time. I think you summed it up when you said that something gets started and you can not find a plumber who can turn the faucet off. That is all. Many of the activities go on simply because they have been going on. There is no real purpose present even in complicated things like the war in Laos. It is going on because it was going on. I have heard no good purpose announced as to why we are waging that kind of war at the present time on such a scale. But it is simply that it was going on and, for the same reasons as you say, it develops its own momentum. It is very difficult to stop these operations once they are under way. Vast organizations get set up and it takes a herculean effort to stop them.

Mr. BARTLETT. I hope that the faucet that we have got running now does not turn into a fire hose as the result of some enlargement of the issues.

I thank you very much for your courtesy.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you, Mr. Bartlett. I think your testimony is very useful and very helpful. Thank you for coming.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I submit two pieces for the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. They will be received.

(The information referred to follows:)

JULY 1970.

MEMORANDUM BY PAUL BARTLETT

Subject: Proposed changes in U.S. Government funded broadcasting.

1. USIA

The Voice of America and other broadcasting activities of the USIA should be removed from that agency and placed in a public corporation similar to Comsat in which private capital could participate, and which can exercise full commercial flexibility in improving U.S. overseas broadcasting.

## *2. Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*

RFE and Radio Liberty should be closed down and their facilities put to other use, or in the alternative, they should be so changed and reoriented as to be in the end completely new and different operations.

## *3. Armed Forces Radio and TV Service*

AFRTS activities should be limited to combat areas and replaced elsewhere by services provided by private companies, or by the public company proposed to undertake the present USIA operations.

---

[From Variety, New York, Jan. 6, 1971]

### AMERICAN-SOVIET "BROADCASTING WAR," OR HOW'S YOUR EAST-WEST PROPAGANDA?

(By Paul Bartlett)

The American-Soviet "broadcasting war", already somewhat warmer, may get a lot hotter before it starts to cool, judging by comments made by Russian authorities at Radio Moscow.

The recent heatup stems in part from the Czech crisis, but its real basis is the continued operation of the so-called "private" American anti-Soviet Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in West Germany; renewed large scale American jamming of Radio Moscow; and the more aggressive policies of the current USIA management.

Russian spokesmen claim that "more than 100 U.S. operated stations, ringing the Soviet borders, broadcast hostile propaganda into the U.S.S.R. daily," and they coyly add that they are "not powerless to do something about it if it becomes necessary".

Contrary to the usual public concept this American-Soviet "broadcasting war" is not really a matter of who says what over the air, but is on the contrary a diplomatic struggle over operating bases, transmitter horsepower, and the East-West philosophical differences over how the hardware should be used.

The nearly inescapable conclusion is that neither East nor West is really subverting the other by anything said over-the-air. The beneficiaries appear to be the bureaucrats of each side who seek more budget and hardware—the losers being the taxpayers who pick up the tab for these ethereal high junks!

### ANTI-NIXON BIAS

In an hour-long wideranging discussion of international broadcasting the Muscovites showed an obvious grasp of the U.S. political scene, but seemed foolishly paranoid in their dislike of President Nixon, and unwilling to believe that relations could improve during his tenure. In all fairness, recent utterances by USIA chief Frank Shakespeare, Jr. lend credence to this belief, and if his hard line really reflects the President's views the Soviets could be right.

However that may be, the Russians appear more annoyed by hostile American intentions and actions than actually hurt by U.S. efforts.

This conclusion was reinforced by conversations at the U.S. Embassy and with other Americans in Russia, and in talks with Soviet citizens themselves. All confirm that jamming is so effective that American services seep into the wide open spaces, but are little heard in population centres.

On this observer's receiver at the Hotel Rossya in Moscow (with 20 feet of antenna out the window) the jammers, said to be in the Hotel Ukraine, wiped out everything near the Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe frequencies. The Voice of America English-language service fares better, and BBC in English is excellent.

### RADIO LIBERTY AND RFE

Russian annoyance with Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe is easy to understand. Both these so-called "private" American services are based in Munich and both seek to "tell East Zone populations what they ought to know",

which is, of course, an euphonious way of saying they try to foment or exploit unrest in the Eastern Bloc.

In practice, this often means, as far as Radio Liberty is concerned, reading over the air, in various Soviet dialects, publications banned in the USSR, a practice reportedly popular with Russian authors unpublished at home who are not averse to using Uncle Sam as a free literary agent. Naturally Liberty's touting of dissident Soviet intellectuals also irks the Kremlin, even if few Russians hear the broadcasts.

Although RFE carefully disavows having encouraged the Hungarians some years back, it likes to take credit for embarrassing the Soviets in Czechoslovakia or for playing up recent Polish disorders. For their part some East Bloc countries, in their frustration, give RFE no little satisfaction by blaming the Munich operation for fomenting troubles. But the fact seems to be that RFE is so heavily jammed that it is probably little more than an irritant as a broadcasting service.

In the past, Soviet experts have differentiated sharply between Voice of America broadcasts, which they consider to be official U.S. Government policy announcements, and the broadcasts of Radio Liberty and RFE which also come from Washington, but claim to be from "private" stations. The Russians claim Washington says on Liberty and RFE things it would be ashamed to put under a State Department by-line.

More recently the USIA under Shakespeare, Loomis & Co. appear to be taking a more independent line as evidenced in the Secretary Rogers' rebuke to Shakespeare and latter's "you're not my boss" reply!

VOA's stepped-up jamming operations, recently publicized by Marilyn Berger's Washington Post story, are something again. Previously little known even in the Congress, this operation involves the renewed VOA operation of a 1,000,000 watt nondirectional longwave station in Munich, on the Radio Moscow home frequency, for the express purpose of destroying Radio Moscow service over thousands of miles of Soviet home territory.

The purpose of the operation is to blackmail the Kremlin into reduced jamming of U.S. signals destined for the East. Its destructive operations is nothing short of a disgrace for America. Certainly no Soviet jamming is comparable.

At Radio Moscow they say they "have no knowledge of jamming" and then explain it would be done by another government agency if there were any. But anyone who tunes a radio can hear for himself that there is a tremendous amount of jamming in Moscow and Leningrad, and maybe even more in some East Zone areas.

Unfortunately the Russians have no frame of reference for understanding how anyone could object to a government wanting to control what its citizens hear. The said truth is that under Czar or Politburo, the Russian State has controlled what is read or said in Russia for nine centuries, and there are few signs that Comrade Brezhnev or Kosygin will suddenly change the rules notwithstanding the rumblings in the wings.

There really will be pie in the sky if the "Munich megawatt" is able to blackmail the Kremlin into doing something it has not done in nearly 1,000 years.

#### BERLIN

Among all the battlefronts on which the "broadcasting war" is being fought, Berlin is perhaps the most fascinating, and maybe the most crucial, but here again it is not what is said that counts so much as the management of the facilities over which it is said.

The American operation in West Berlin, known as RIAS, has been a pet hate of the Russians and East Germans for years, and both are determined to drive it out of the city. Its fate is sure to be part of any Berlin settlement.

But the truth is that RIAS is today a weary leftover from the immediate post-war days, living in memories of the Berlin blockade, and muttering at the wall. It is undoubtedly important psychologically as part of the American presence in Berlin, but as a broadcasting service it is long overdue for replacement.

If America is to win "the Broadcasting Battle of Berlin" we will have to come up with something more effective and imaginative than RIAS—and soon!

#### BONN MAY DECIDE

In the end Bonn could well be the determining factor in who the winner of this superpower broadcasting struggle will be. The American broadcasting operations in Germany are subject to short cancellation.

The Kremlin has made it abundantly clear that it intends to get Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe out of Germany as part of the price for Soviet-German friendship. Bonn claims that German-American solidarity is a cornerstone of her foreign policy, and insists she will not make a final treaty with her Eastern neighbors until the Berlin question is settled.

Reconciling these conflicting broadcasting interests will require Herr Brandt to develop the juggling act of the decade, and while he is perfecting his act the heat will be on from all sides.

The CHAIRMAN. Anything further?

Senator CASE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee is adjourned.

Whereupon, at 1 p.m. the committee was adjourned.

Approved For Release 2007/01/18 : CIA-RDP73B00296R000500050001-0

Approved For Release 2007/01/18 : CIA-RDP73B00296R000500050001-0

## APPENDIX

### U.S. GOVERNMENT RADIO FACILITIES IN EUROPE

(Submitted by Department of State)

Attached are listings of the Europe-based transmitting facilities of: 1) the American Forces Network, Europe (AFNE); 2) RIAS (Radio in the American Sector of Berlin); 3) the Voice of America; 4) Radio Free Europe and 5) Radio Liberty. The listings indicate the location, the power in watts or kilowatts, the type (short-wave, medium-wave, long-wave, or FM), and the hours in use for each transmitter (for all except AFNE). The VOA listing includes facilities outside the European continent (U.S.A., Morocco, and Liberia) which are also being used to cover areas reached by RFE and RL, as well as those in Greece, Germany, and the U.K.<sup>1</sup>

By agreement with the host governments, the AFNE stations are authorized to broadcast for the sole purpose of reaching American troops.

With two possible exceptions, all of the AFNE facilities are of low power and could not be used to reach areas covered by RFE and RL. The two include the 150,000-watt medium-wave transmitter in Frankfurt/Weisskirchen and the 50,000-watt medium-wave transmitter in Munich. However, the antennas of these two high-powered stations were designed to maximize the signal in Western Germany and minimize the signal to the East.

RIAS has eight transmitters, of which six are in Berlin and two near Hof, in Northern Bavaria. Those in Berlin are: one medium-wave (MW) of 200,000 watts, one MW of 100,000 watts, another MW of 100,000 watts (of which the first two can be combined on a single frequency at 300,000 watts); two FM of 10,000 watts apiece; and one short-wave of 20,000 watts. None of these transmitters can reach effectively beyond East Germany. Of the transmitters located at Hof, one is a medium-wave of 40,000 watts, one an FM transmitter of 6,500 watts. Except for the border area near Hof, the effective coverage is limited to East Germany.

As may be seen from the data on VOA, the amount of time available on its facilities for broadcasting in the languages concerned is only a fraction of that available to RFE and RL.

#### DAILY TRANSMITTER HOURS

	VOA	RFE	RL
In Eastern European languages.....	56½	547	266
In Soviet languages.....	135		

Thus, RFE is on the air nearly ten times as many transmitter hours as VOA and RL nearly twice as many. (Also, while VOA broadcasts in all of the six languages of RFE, it carries only four of the eighteen languages of RL.) With its facilities, there is no way that VOA transmitters could carry more than a small percentage of RFE/RL broadcasts into the reception areas concerned at desirable times except by a significant reduction of broadcasts in other languages and to other reception areas elsewhere in the world.

<sup>1</sup> VOA transmitters are sometimes used for purposes other than direct broadcast of VOA programs. There are feed services in Arabic and Greek, intended for the Arabic Program Center on Rhodes and for USIS in Athens, respectively. VOA also transmits the wireless file of USIA's International Press Service, e.g., the Middle East File. In certain countries, such as Greece and Morocco, agreements with the host governments call for a sharing of facilities. NBI is the Greek national radio. VOA also relays broadcasts of the United Nations radio, e.g., UN to Europe and the Middle East.

The agreements by which the different stations broadcast are as follows:  
The American Forces Network, Europe broadcasts by agreement with the host governments.

VOA broadcasts in accordance with bilateral agreements between the USG and the host governments, with the exception of the U.K., which is by contract with the British Broadcasting Corporation.

For RIAS, the rights to the Berlin facilities are by virtue of the U.S. occupation and the operation is by a joint arrangement with the government of the FRG. The Hof facilities are operated in accordance with a bilateral agreement with the FRG government.

In Germany, RFE operates by license from the FRG Ministry of Posts and Telecommunications to Free Europe, Inc. In Portugal, a Portuguese corporation, the Sociedade Anonima de Radio Retransmissao, acts on behalf of RFE in procuring the license from the Portuguese Post, Telegraph and Telephone Administration.

RL in Germany operates by license from the FRG Ministry of Posts and Telecommunications to the Radio Liberty Committee, Inc. In Spain, the agreement is between the Radio Liberty Committee, Inc., and the Spanish Ministry of Information and Tourism.

## AMERICAN FORCES NETWORK, EUROPE

Location	Power	Type
<b>Belgium:</b>		
Brussels	75	FM
Casteau	4 kilowatts	FM
<b>The Netherlands:</b>		
Brunssum	75	FM
Soesterberg	20	FM
Maastricht	75	FM
<b>Germany:</b>		
Amberg	8	MW
Ansbach	250	MW
Augsburg	1 kilowatt	MW
Augsburg	15 kilowatts	MW
Bad Hersfeld	250	MW
Bad Kissingen	250	MW
Bamberg	250	MW
Bayreuth	250	MW
Berchtesgaden	Closed circuit	MW
Berlin	250	MW
Berlin	10 kilowatts	MW
Berlin	1.5 kilowatts	MW
Bitberg	250	FM
Bonn	75	MW
Bremerhaven	5 kilowatts	MW
Crailsheim	250	MW
Frankfurt/Weiskirchen	150 kilowatts	MW
Frankfurt/Feldberg	60 kilowatts	FM
Fulda	250	MW
Garmisch	250	MW
Giessen	250	MW
Goeppingen	250	MW
Grafenwoehr	10 kilowatts	MW
Hohenfels	250	MW
Hof	1 kilowatt	MW
Illsheim (FM)	375	MW
Kaiserslautern	10 kilowatts	MW
Karlsruhe	1 kilowatt	MW
Kassel	Closed circuit	MW
Munich	50 kilowatts	MW
Nurnberg	10 kilowatts	MW
Pirmasens (FM)	375	MW
Pruem	Closed circuit	MW
Rogensburg	250	MW
Rothwesten	250	MW
Schweinfurt	250	MW
Stuttgart	10 kilowatts	MW
Stuttgart (FM)	100	MW
Ulm	1 kilowatt	MW
Wertheim	250	MW
Wildflecken	250	MW
Wurzburg	250	MW
Wieblingen	1 kilowatt	MW
Wieblingen (FM)	375	MW
<b>Greece:</b>		
Iraklion, Crete	250	MW
Athens	1 kilowatt	MW

133

Location	Power	Type
Italy:		
Aviano.....	50.....	FM
Livorno.....	Closed circuit.....	MW
Livorno.....	50.....	FM
Martina.....	Audio distribution system.....	
Mount Vergine.....	Audio distribution system.....	
Naples.....	50.....	FM
Reggio.....	Audio distribution system.....	
San Vito.....	50.....	FM
Verona.....	Closed circuit.....	MW
Verona (FM).....	50.....	FM
Vicenza.....	Closed circuit.....	MW
Vicenza (FM).....	50.....	FM
Sigonella, Sicily (FM).....	50.....	FM
Spain:		
Inoges.....	Audio distribution system.....	
Moron.....	50.....	FM
Rota.....	1 kilowatt.....	FM
San Pablo.....	1 kilowatt.....	FM
Soller, Majorca.....	Audio distribution system.....	
Torrejon (FM).....	1 kilowatt.....	FM
Zaragoza (FM).....	50.....	FM

## VOICE OF AMERICA—MONROVIA RELAY STATION

Transmitter	Power (kw)	Type	On air (GMT)	Language
1.....	250	SW.....	2100-2130	Russian.
2.....	250	SW.....	2115-2200	Do.
3.....	250	SW.....	2115-2200	Do.

## RIAS

Transmitter	Location	Power (kw)	Type	On air (GMT)	(All German) program
1 and 2.....	Berlin.....	300	MW	0325-2340	RIAS I.
1.....	do.....	200	MW	2340-0135	RIAS I.
2.....	do.....	100	MW	0135-0315	RIAS I.
3.....	do.....	100	MW	0741-1459	RIAS I.
4.....	do.....	100	MW	1500-2345	RIAS II.
5.....	do.....	10	FM	(?)	RIAS I—II.
6.....	do.....	10	FM	(?)	RIAS I—II.
7.....	do.....	20	SW	1730-0315	RIAS I.
8.....	HOF.....	40	MW	0741-1459	RIAS I.
9.....	HOF.....	40	MW	1500-0035	RIAS I.
10.....	HOF.....	6.5	FM	(?)	RIAS I—II.

1 24 hours, varied.

## VOICE OF AMERICA

Transmitter	Power (kw)	Type	On air (GMT)	Language
Munich Relay Station:				
1.....	300	MW	0200-0730	0200-0300 Ukrainian. 0300-0400 Russian. 0400-0415 Slovene. 0415-1430 Hungarian. 0430-0445 Czech. 0445-0515 Polish. 0515-0530 Hungarian. 0530-0545 Czech. 0545-0600 Slovene. 0600-0730 English.
2.....	1,000	LW	1600-2200	1600-2000 English. 2000-2200 Russian.
3.....	100	SW	0200-0745	0200-0300 Ukrainian. 0300-0500 Russian. 0500-0730 English. 0730-0745 Greek.
			1300-2230	1300-1400 Georgian. 1400-1500 Armenian. 1500-1600 Ukrainian.

134

## VOICE OF AMERICA—Continued

Transmitter	Power (kw)	Type	On air (GMT)	Language
4.....	100	SW	0200-0730	1600-1630 Bulgarian. 1630-1700 Turkish. 1700-1800 Romanian. 1800-1830 Greek. 1830-1900 Bulgarian. 1900-1930 Albanian. 1930-2000 Serbo-Croatian. 2000-2030 Romanian. 2030-2100 Serbo-Croatian. 2100-2200 Russian. 2200-2230 French. 0200-0300 Ukrainian. 0300-0500 Russian. 0500-0730 English. 1500-1630 1500-1530 Estonian. 1530-1600 Lithuanian. 1600-1730 Latvian. 1700-1400 1700-2100 Arabic. 2100-2200 Russian. 2200-2230 French.
5.....	100	SW	0300-0730	0300-0500 Russian. 0500-0730 English. 1300-1630 1300-1630 Do. 1700-2200 1700-2100 Arabic. 2100-2200 Russian. 2230-2400 2230-2400 English. 0400-1730 0400-1730 RIAS. 1800-2200 1800-2200 Russian. 0300-0730 0300-0730 English. 1600-2400 1600-2400 Do.
6.....	100	SW		
7.....	8	SW		
Rhodes Relay Station:				
1.....	150	MW	0300-0730	0300-0400 Do. 0400-0600 Arabic. 0600-0730 English. 1400-2400 1400-1630 Do. 1630-1700 Turkish. 1700-2100 Arabic. 2100-2400 English. 0400-0600 0400-0600 Arabic. 1400-2100 1400-1500 Urdu. 1500-1600 Hindi. 1600-1630 English. 1630-1700 Turkish. 1700-2100 Arabic. 2115-2145 2115-2145 Russian. 2200-2230 2200-2230 French. 0400-0600 0400-0600 Arabic. 1300-2100 1300-1400 Georgian. 1400-1500 Armenian. 1500-1600 Ukrainian. 1600-1630 English. 1630-1700 Turkish. 1700-2100 Arabic. 2115-2145 2115-2145 Russian. 2200-2230 2200-2230 French.
2.....	50	SW	0400-0600	0400-0600 Arabic. 1400-2100 1400-1500 Urdu. 1500-1600 Hindi. 1600-1630 English. 1630-1700 Turkish. 1700-2100 Arabic. 2115-2145 2115-2145 Russian. 2200-2230 2200-2230 French.
3.....	50	SW		
Tangier Relay Station:				
1.....	100	SW	0200-0500	English. 0530-0800 0530-0600 Arabic. 0600-0730 French. 0730-0800 Arabic. 1400-1730 1400-1500 Urdu. 1500-1600 Hindi. 1600-1730 English.
2.....	100	SW	1800-2400	Arabic. 0200-0500 0200-0300 Ukrainian. 0300-0500 Russian. 0600-0900 Rabat. 1200-1500 Rabat. 1600-2200 1600-1630 Bulgarian. 1630-1700 Turkish. 1700-1800 Romanian. 1800-1830 Greek. 1830-1900 Bulgarian. 1900-1930 Albanian. 1930-2000 Serbo-Croatian. 2000-2030 Romanian. 2030-2100 Serbo-Croatian. 2100-2200 Russian.
3.....	100	SW	2230-2400	English. 0200-0330 English. 0345-0615 0345-0400 Bulgarian. 0400-0415 Slovene.

135

Transmitter	Power (kw)	Type	On air (GMT)	Language
4.....	100	SW	0200-0745 1500-2130	0415-0430 Hungarian. 0430-0445 Czech. 0445-0515 Polish. 0515-0530 Hungarian. 0530-0545 Czech. 0545-0600 Slovene. 0600-0615 Bulgarian. 0630-0700 UN to Eur/ME. 1300-2400 1300-1400 Georgian. 1400-1500 Armenian. 1500-1600 Ukrainian. 1600-1800 Russian. 1800-2400 English. 0200-0730 English. 0730-0745 Greek. 1500-1530 Estonian. 1530-1600 Lithuanian. 1600-1630 Latvian. 1630-1700 Czech. 1700-1730 Polish. 1730-1900 Hungarian. 1900-2000 Polish. 2000-2100 Czech. 2100-2130 Hungarian.
5.....	35	SW	2200-2400 0200-0230 0300-0745	2200-2400 English. 0200-0215 Arabic feed. 0215-0230 Lebanon/Kuwait feeds, 0300-0730 English. 0730-0745 Greek.
6.....	35	SW	1600-2000 2015-2215 0200-0745	1600-2000 Russian. 2015-2215 English. 0200-0300 Ukrainian. 0300-0500 Russian. 0500-0730 English. 0730-0745 Greek.
7.....	35	SW	1400-1630 1700-1715 1730-2200 0300-0730 1300-1600 1630-0230	1400-1500 Armenian. 1500-1600 Ukrainian. 1600-1630 Bulgarian. 1700-1715 French. 1730-1800 English. 1800-2200 Russian. 0300-0730 English. 1300-1600 English. 1630-1800 English. 1800-1830 Greek. 1830-1900 Bulgarian. 1900-2100 French. 2100-0230 IPS ME File.
8.....	35	SW	0300-0500 0530-0800	0300-0500 Russian. 0530-0600 Arabic. 0600-0730 French. 0730-0800 Arabic.
9.....	35	SW	1400-1530 1600-1730 1745-0200	1400-1500 Urdu. 1500-1530 Hindi. 1600-1730 Russian. 1745-2200 Russian.
10.....	50	SW	0200-0500 0530-0615 0630-0900 1200-1500 1600-2400	0200-0200 IPS Mid-East file. 0200-0215 Arabic feed. 0215-0230 Lebanon/Kuwait feed. 0230-0245 Arabic feed. 0245-0300 German feed. 0300-0500 Russian. 0530-0545 Czech. 0545-0600 Slovene. 0600-0615 Bulgarian. 0630-0700 UN Europe/ME. 0700-0900 Rabat French. 1200-1400 Rabat French. 1400-1500 Rabat French. 1600-1630 Bulgarian. 1630-1700 Turkish. 1700-1800 Rabat English. 1800-2230 Rabat French. 2320-2400 Rabat Spanish.
10.....	50	SW	0345-0615	0345-0400 Bulgarian. 0400-0415 Slovene. 0415-0430 Hungarian. 0430-0445 Czech. 0445-0515 Polish. 0515-0530 Hungarian. 0530-0545 Czech. 0545-0600 Slovene. 0600-0615 Bulgarian.

## VOICE OF AMERICA—Continued

Transmitter	Power (kw) Type	On air (GMT)	Language
		0630-0900	0630-0700 UN Europe/ME.
			0700-0900 Rabat French.
		1200-1500	1200-1400 Rabat French.
			1400-1500 Rabat Spanish.
		1530-2200	1530-1600 Hindi.
			1600-1630 Bulgarian.
			1630-1700 Turkish.
			1700-1800 Romanian.
			1800-2200 Rabat Arabic.
Thessaloniki Relay Station:			
1.....	50 MW	0430-2230	0430-1700 NBI Greek.
			1700-1800 Romanian.
			1800-1900 English.
			1900-1930 Albanian.
			1930-2000 Serbo-Croatian.
			2000-2030 NBI Greek.
			2030-2100 Serbo-Croatian.
			2100-2130 English.
			2130-2230 NBI Greek.
2.....	35 SW.....	1300-2230	1300-1400 Georgian.
			1400-1500 Armenian.
			1500-1600 Ukrainian.
			1600-1815 Russian.
			1815-2230 English.
3.....	35 SW	1300-2200	1300-1400 Georgian.
			1400-1500 Armenian.
			1500-1600 Ukrainian.
			1600-2200 Russian.
4.....	35 SW	1100-1430	1100-1430 NBI Greek.
		1500-1930	1500-1530 Estonian.
			1530-1600 Lithuanian.
			1600-1630 Latvian.
			1630-1700 Estonian.
			1700-1730 Lithuanian.
			1730-1800 Latvian.
			1800-1930 Russian.
		2000-2030	2000-2030 MBI Greek.
		2100-2400	2100-2400 English.
5.....	35 SW	1630-2130	1630-1700 Czech.
			1700-1730 Polish.
			1730-1900 Hungarian.
			1900-2000 Polish.
			2000-2100 Czech.
			2100-2130 Hungarian.
Woolferton (England) Relay Station:			
1.....	250 SW	0200-0300	0200-0300 Ukrainian.
		0345-0165	0345-0400 Bulgarian.
			0400-0415 Slovene.
			0415-0430 Hungarian.
			0430-0445 Czech-Slovak.
			0445-0515 Polish.
			0515-0530 Hungarian.
			0530-0545 Czech-Slovak.
			0545-0600 Slovene.
			0600-0615 Bulgarian.
		1300-2200	1300-1600 English.
			1600-2200 Russian.
2.....	250 SW	0200-0500	0200-0300 Ukrainian.
			0300-0500 Russian.
		0530-0800	0530-0600 Arabic.
			0600-0730 French.
			0730-0800 Arabic.
		1500-1630	1500-1530 Estonian.
			1530-1600 Lithuanian.
			1600-1630 Latvian.
		1700-2230	1700-1800 Rumanian.
			1800-1830 Greek.
			1830-1900 Bulgarian.
			1900-1930 Albanian.
			1930-2000 Serbo-Croatian.
			2000-2030 Rumanian.
			2030-2100 Serbo-Croatian.
			2100-2200 Russian.
			2200-2230 French.
3.....	250 SW	0200-0500	0200-0300 Ukrainian.
			0300-0500 Russian.
		0530-0800	0530-0600 Arabic.
			0600-0730 French.
			0730-0800 Arabic.
		1300-1600	1300-1600 English.
		1630-2130	1630-1700 Czech-Slovak.

137

Transmitter	Power (kw) Type	On air (GMT)	Language
4.....	250 SW	1700-1730 Polish. 1730-1900 Hungarian. 1900-2000 Polish. 2000-2100 Czech-Slovak. 2100-2130 Hungarian. 2200-2230 French. 0300-0730 English. 1300-2015 1300-1400 Georgian. 1400-1500 Armenian. 1500-1600 Ukrainian. 1600-2015 English. 2030-2200 Russian. 0200-0730 English. 1300-2230 English.	
5.....	250 SW	0345-0545 0345-0400 Bulgarian. 0400-0415 Slovene. 0415-0430 Hungarian. 0430-0445 Czech-Slovak. 0445-0515 Polish. 0515-0530 Hungarian. 0530-0545 Czech-Slovak. 0600-0800 0600-0615 Bulgarian. 0615-0730 French. 0730-0800 Arabic. 1300-2230 1300-1400 Georgian. 1400-1500 Urdu. 1500-1600 Hindi. 1600-2200 Russian. 2200-2230 French.	
6.....	250 SW		

Language	Time	Stateside feeder transmitters <sup>1</sup>	Language	Time	Stateside feeder transmitters <sup>1</sup>
Czech.....	0430-0445	GRN 250/250	Bulgarian--Continued	1600-1630	GRN 250
	0530-0545	GRN 250/250		1830-1900	GRN 250
	1630-1700	GRN 500/250	Rumanian.....	1700-1800	GRN 250
Hungarian.....	2000-2100	GRN 500/250		2000-2030	GRN 250
	0415-0430	GRN 250/250	Armenian.....	1400-1500	GRN 250/250/50 BY 175
	0515-0530	GRN 250/250	Georgian.....	1300-1400	GRN 250/250/50 BY 175
	1730-1900	GRN 500/250	Ukrainian.....	0200-0300	GRN 250/250
Polish.....	2100-2130	GRN 500/250	Russian.....	1500-1600	GRN 250/250/50 BY 175
	0445-0515	GRN 250/250		0300-0500	GRN 250/250
	1700-1730	GRN 500/250		1600-1700	GRN 250/250/50 BY 175
Bulgarian.....	1900-2000	GRN 500/250		1700-2000	GRN 250/250 BY 175
	0345-0400	GRN 250/250/250		2000-2200	GRN 500/250 BY 175
	0600-0615	GRN 250/250			

<sup>1</sup> Power is in kilowatts.<sup>2</sup> Greenville, N.C.<sup>3</sup> Bethany, Ohio.

## BIBLIS (GERMANY)

Transmitter	Power (Kw) Type	On Air (GMT)	Language
1.....	20 SW	2300-0015 Czech. 0400-0600 Hungarian. 0630-2030 Do. 2030-2300 Do.	
2.....	50 SW	0530-2030 Czech. 2045-0015 Do. 0400-0515 Do.	
3.....	50 SW	2015-0015 Rumanian. 0400-0600 Do. 0615-0800 Do.	
4.....	50 S.V	0815-1445 Polish. 1500-2015 Rumanian. 2015-0015 Do. 0400-0600 Do. 0600-0800 Do.	
5.....	10 SW	0815-1415 Hungarian. 1500-1815 Rumanian. 1830-2115 Do.	
6.....	10 SW	2300-0015 Czech. 0415-0645 Do. 0645-2100 Polish. 2130-2300 Do. 2300-0015 Czech. 0545-0700 Polish. 0715-1845 Do. 1900-2300 Do.	

138

Transmitter.....	Power (Kw)	Type	On Air (GMT)	Language
7.....	10	SW	1845-0015 0400-0500 0715-1845	Czech. Rumanian. Czech.
8.....	10	SW	1830-0015 0400-0615 0700-1830	Do. Rumanian. Czech.
9.....	10	SW	2300-0015 0715-1915 1930-2300	Do. Hungarian. Do.
RFE—HOLZKIRCHEN (GERMANY)				
1.....	10	SW	0400-0600 1600-1900 1915-2145	Bulgarian. Do. Do.
2.....	10	SW	2200-0015 0400-0600 1600-2045	Czech. Bulgarian. Do.
3.....	10	SW	2100-2145 2100-0015 0400-0600	Do. Czech. Polish.
4.....	10	SW	0715-0815 0830-1415 1430-1900	Do. Czech. Polish.
MWT.....	150	MW	1930-2100 0630-0815 1415-1930	Do. Hungarian. Do.
			0400-0615 0615-1700 1700-0015	Polish. Czech. Polish.
RFE—LISBON				
1.....	250	SW	0400-0530 0600-1500 1500-2300	Do. Do. Do.
2.....	250	SW	2300-0000 0400-0630 0700-2300	Hungarian. Do. Do.
3.....	250	SW	2300-2400 0400-0500 0530-0800	Czech. Do. Do.
4.....	250	SW	0400-0600 0615-0545 1600-2145	Bulgarian. Czech. Bulgarian.
5.....	100	SW	2200-0015 0400-0630 0700-2030	Czech. Hungarian. Do.
6.....	100	SW	2030-2300 2300-0015 0400-0645	Do. Czech. Polish.
7.....	100	SW	0700-2045 2100-2300 2300-0015	Do. Do. Czech.
8.....	100	SW	0400-0600 0600-2115 0630-0800	Romanian. Czech. Romanian.
9.....	50	SW	0815-1445 1500-2100 2115-2300	Polish. Romanian. Do.
10.....	50	SW	2300-0015 2300-0530 2130-0630	Czech. Do. Do.
11.....	50	SW	0400-0530 0630-0800 0815-1430	Romanian. Do. Polish.
			1500-1800 1800-2000 0400-0630	Polish. Polish. Romanian.
			0630-0800 0815-1430 1500-2300	Do. Polish. Romanian.
			0400-0500 0515-0700 0630-0730	Bulgarian. Do. Czech.
			0630-1545 0745-1545 1600-2130	Do. Do. Bulgarian.
			2200-0030	Czech.

139

Transmitter	Power (Kw)	Type	On Air (GMT)	Language
12.....	50	SW	0400-0600 1600-2015 2200-0100	Bulgarian. Do. Polish.
13.....	50	SW	0400-0715 0730-1830 1830-2200	Do. Do. Do.
14.....	50	SW	2200-0015 0400 0715 0730-1915 1930-2300	Czech. Hungarian. Do. Do.
15.....	50	SW	2300-0015 0400-0700 0715-2015 2030-2130	Czech. Do. Do. Do.
16.....	50	SW	2200-2400 0400-0700 0715-0900 0930-1800 1830-2200	Polish. Czech. Do. Do. Do.
17.....	25	SW	2200-2400 0400-0615	Polish. Czech.
18.....	10	SW	0630-2200 0700-2030	Do. Polish.
RL-LAMPERTHEIM (GERMANY)				
1.....	50	SW	2300-0345 0400-1100 1400-2300	Russian. Do. Ukrainian
2.....	50	SW	2200-2400 0000-0100 0100-0200 0200-0300 0400-0500 0500-0600 0600-0700 0800-1300 1300-1400 1400-1600 1600-1700 1700-1800 1800-1900 1900-2000 2000-2100 2100-2200	Russian. North Caucasian. <sup>2</sup> Azeri. Georgian. North Caucasian. <sup>1</sup> Azeri. Armenian. Russian. North Caucasian. <sup>1</sup> Russian. Azeri. North Caucasian. <sup>1</sup> Georgian. Armenian. Azeri. Russian.
3.....	50	SW	1600-1900 2200-0300 0300-0400 0400-0600 0600-1000 1400-1500 1500-1600 1800-2200	Do. Ukrainian. Russian. Ukrainian. Russian. Georgian. Armenian. Russian.
4.....	50	SW	2100-0400 0400-2030	Do. Do.
5.....	50	SW	0000-0100 0100-0200 0200-0300 0300-0400 0400-0500 0500-0600 0600-0700 0700-0800 0800-1300 1300-1400 1400-1500 1500-1600 1600-1700 1700-1800 1800-1900 1900-2000 2000-2100 2100-2400	North Caucasian. <sup>1</sup> Azeri. Armenian. Georgian. North Caucasian. <sup>1</sup> Azeri. Armenian. Georgian. Russian. North Caucasian. <sup>1</sup> Georgian. Armenian. Azeri. North Caucasian. <sup>1</sup> Georgian. Armenian. Azeri. Russian. Belorussian. Russian. Belorussian. Russian.
6.....	50	SW	0200-0500 0500-0700	Belorussian. Russian.
7.....	10	SW	2200-2400 0000-0400 0400-0700	Do. Do. Do.
8.....	20	SW	0000-0700 1900-2100 2200-2400	Do. Do. Do.

See footnote end of table, p. 140.

140

RL-PALS, SPAIN

Transmitter	Power (Kw)	Type	On Air (GMT)	Language
1.....	250	SW	2200-0500	Do.
			0530-2200	Do.
2.....	250	SW	2200-0300	Do.
			0300-0500	Tatar.
			0530-2200	Russian.
3.....	250	SW	1400-1600	Tatar.
			1600-2400	Russian.
			0000-0100	Do.
4.....	250	SW	0300-1400	Do.
			2100-2300	Do.
			0030-0500	Do.
			0600-1400	Do.
5.....	250	SW	1400-2100	Do.
			2100-2300	Do.
			2300-0000	Do.
			0000-0200	Turkestan. <sup>2</sup>
			0200-0500	Ukrainian.
			0500-1300	Russian.
			1300-1500	Turkestan. <sup>2</sup>
			1500-1700	Russian.
6.....	100	SW	1700-2100	Ukrainian.
			2200-0000	Russian.
			0000-0400	Do.
			0400-1000	Do.
			1000-1400	Do.
			1400-2200	Do.

<sup>1</sup> The North Caucasian languages include Adyge, Avar, Chechen/Ingush, Karachay/Balkar, and Ossetian.<sup>2</sup> The Turkestan languages are Kazakh, Kirghiz, Tajik, Vigur, and Uzbek.

## STATEMENT BY FREE EUROPE, INC., SUBMITTED BY WILLIAM P. DURKEE, PRESIDENT

EAST EUROPE AND RADIO FREE EUROPE IN AN "ERA OF NEGOTIATION"<sup>1</sup>

Developments within the Communist bloc, together with a growing mutual appreciation of the risks involved in confrontations between nuclear powers, appeared by the late 1960s to have created new possibilities for negotiating East-West differences. Agreements have been reached to prohibit the proliferation of atomic weapons, to ban their testing in space and under water, and to preclude the use of Antarctica and outer space for military purposes. Discussions are being held or are in preparation on strategic arms limitation, the status of Berlin, arms control on the seabed, the Middle East crisis. A Bonn-Moscow non-aggression treaty has been signed. Beyond this, the West is clearly ready, as President Nixon has put it, to undertake negotiations looking to "a gradual normalization of relations" with the Communist countries and to greater cooperation in "the economic, technical, scientific and cultural field."<sup>2</sup>

In these circumstances, a question may arise as to whether continued Western-sponsored broadcasting to the peoples of Communist Europe over the heads, as it were, of their governments is likely to help or hinder the attempt to negotiate more normal East-West relationships.

For the West, the wisdom of continuing such broadcasting in an "era of negotiation" would logically depend on a judgment as to whether the continued access of East Europeans to the full range of news and opinion concerning their own as well as external affairs is likely to help or hinder the development of genuinely stable and normal relations between East and West. If such relations could be expected to emerge without the further evolution and moderation of Communist policy in East Europe and the Soviet Union—or if it could be shown that Western

<sup>1</sup> This paper in a slightly longer version was submitted to the Board of Directors of Free Europe, Inc., and approved at a regular meeting on October 15, 1970. Footnotes and Annexes have been added in order to incorporate subsequent developments and to illustrate, elaborate, or corroborate in some detail the analysis set forth herein. The paper was also submitted to the West European Advisory Committee of Radio Free Europe for its meeting October 24-25, 1970. For a note on this Committee and pertinent Congressional testimony by its Chairman, Dr. Dirk Stikker, former Secretary General of NATO and Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, see Annex V—*The West European Advisory Committee on Radio Free Europe*. Two other reports submitted to that session of the Advisory Committee are attached hereto as Annex XVII—*Recent Developments and the Current Political Scene in the Soviet Union and East Europe*, and Annex XVIII—*Social Forces and Trends in East Europe*.

<sup>2</sup> *U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's*, A Report to the Congress, February 18, 1970, p. 139.

broadcasting played no significant and constructive part in that historical process—then a case could be made for restricting or abolishing radio broadcasting to the area, or for making it a bargaining counter in future negotiations. But if the contrary assessment is warranted, it might well be concluded that in an “era of negotiation”, Western broadcasting becomes more rather than less valuable to the cause of peace. In his report to Congress of February 18, 1970, President Nixon warned that in seeking wider negotiations with the Communist countries, we should avoid “the illusion that they have already given up their beliefs or are about to do so.” He added:

“We may hope that the passage of time and the emergence of a new generation in the Communist countries will bring some change in Communist purposes.”<sup>3</sup>

It is to that longer-term process of change that Western international broadcasting makes its unique contribution.

#### THE ROLE OF WESTERN COMMUNICATION

The most significant fact about Communist society in Europe today is the classic conflict that is going on between tendencies toward economic and social modernization and the inertia of institutions and leaders conscious that their political survival may be at stake in the process. The internal forces of East European society are in a state of unstable equilibrium. While revolution is unlikely—and, as a practical matter, undesirable—continued change appears inevitable. This fact confronts the West with both danger and opportunity.

The process of change in East Europe would no doubt be going on even if Western influence were totally absent. Hence the question for the East is not whether Communist societies will continue to evolve, but only at what pace and in what directions. The prospect for continued and accelerated change is enhanced by the fact that more than half of the people of East Europe are under 30 years of age.

But the West—if only by reason of proximity and example—could not repress all influence on East Europe even if it wished to, and the East has not been able to escape it even though it has tried to. Hence the question for the West is not whether to exercise influence on East Europe, but in what ways and to what ends.

Today East and West interact through conscious policies concerned with trade, aid, tourism, cultural exchanges, governmental negotiations, and mass communications.<sup>4</sup> And since all of these relationships have consequences within East European society, there is no way the West can be “neutral” in the internal struggle that is going on there between repression and reform.

The Communist regimes are aware that such interaction may only accelerate the present evolution of their societies. Detente, like reform, can be “subversive”. For this reason—and despite the more businesslike demeanor of Soviet negotiators in the SALT talks, in discussions with the West Germans and elsewhere—the Communist press has seldom been more aggressively hostile to Western institutions and policies than it is today. If they cannot stop the interaction, they can and do try to minimize its “subversive” effects. Thus, the vigilance crusades against ideological deviation, artistic impurity, and fraternization.<sup>5</sup>

Western communication with large numbers of East Europeans is possible only by radio. At its best, international broadcasting performs a combination of functions that can be performed in no other way: it reaches masses of people in otherwise denied areas; it provides a daily service year-round; it supplements and corrects the news as issued by regime media; it supplies alternative analyses, based on interdicted Western sources, of foreign and domestic developments.

There are two irreducible conditions of agreement on any issue; namely, an understanding of the issue and a will to resolve it. To the extent that these are

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 134.

<sup>4</sup> Perhaps because there is comparatively little listening in the West to Communist international broadcasting, it is sometimes forgotten that those operations are very extensive. Radio Moscow alone (in conjunction with the “Independent” Soviet stations “For Peace and Progress” and “A Voice of the Soviet Homeland”) maintains the largest international broadcasting service in the world. (See Annex XV—*External Broadcasting by Communist Countries*.)

<sup>5</sup> See section below, “Communist Regime Reactions to RFE” (p. 14), and Annex XIV—*The Coordination of Soviet and East European Attacks on Radio Free Europe and Chronology of a Soviet and East European Campaign to Oust Radio Free Europe from West Germany (During One Six-Month Period: November 1, 1970 through April 30, 1971)*.

stimulated from below—by the general public, or by influential sectors such as professionals, intellectuals, students—international broadcasting supplies a necessary link in the process of change in East Europe and, therefore, in the process of East-West negotiation.

But the linkage can also be more direct. There is ample evidence that Western broadcasting is closely followed by party leaders at all levels, including the summit. This reduces correspondingly their dependence on limited personal contacts with the West or on the reports of subordinates. Western broadcasting can, then, contribute one element to a continuing learning process in which Communist leaders are enabled to acquire two things of potential value to the West—a more accurate appraisal of Western motives and a broader knowledge of the substantive possibilities for cooperation.

#### RFE—AIMS AND METHODS

By reason of its private status<sup>6</sup> and the specialized linguistic and research capabilities of its staff, Radio Free Europe undertakes a role in that process that other Western broadcasters cannot and do not pretend to duplicate. Unlike any other radio service to East Europe, RFE concentrates a large part of its resources on reporting and analyzing political, economic, social, and cultural developments within its audience area. It seeks to function much as a democratic, responsible, independent station would function within each of the five countries if the regimes permitted it. It seems to have established an identity with its listeners as essentially a national rather than a foreign radio—as “Warsaw 4” to Poles (according to the *Christian Science Monitor*),<sup>7</sup> “Budapest 3” to Hungarians (according to a listener’s letter).

#### *Broadcasting guidelines*

RFE’s standing guidelines call for a policy of balanced commentary coupled with comprehensive, objective, and accurate news reporting, as follows:

“It is essential that RFE, while making clear its dedication to freedom and the principles for which it stands, seek to engender among its listeners, even in the Communist hierarchy, a high degree of respect as a thoroughly responsible and reliable source of news, commentary and other information. . . .

“Comment on internal affairs should be essentially constructive, calm and reasoned, avoiding a belligerent tone. Denunciation and personal attack or ridicule can only serve to prejudice the achievement of RFE policy objectives. RFE will, however, condemn violations of human rights when these are of a nature and magnitude that demand public attention. In dealing with difficulties of which the people may be expected to be aware, care should be taken to clarify their origins and their deeper significance for the mass audience, avoiding polemical treatment of the kind which the audience is known to resent. Meaningful alleviations by the government will be noted as they occur, and professions of intent to make further improvements should be appropriately noted and welcomed. Comments on the internal scene must deal with important issues and be directed toward the attainment of specific aims. Criticism should be selective, never petty, and handled in such a way that it supports the people in striving for further reforms. Criticism of government policies and practices should be

<sup>6</sup> Free Europe, Inc. (Radio Free Europe) is a private, non-profit membership corporation organized under the laws of New York State. Its over-all direction is in the hands of nineteen leading private citizens under the Chairmanship of General Lucius D. Clay (see Annex I—*Officers, Directors and Members of the Corporation of Free Europe, Inc. and RFE Fund, Inc.*). Day-to-day policy decisions with respect to the presentation and interpretation of news developments are reached in daily conferences of the Director of RFE, his policy staff and research specialists. An elaborate system of teletype consultation and reporting assures full policy coordination between the Munich broadcasting center and the New York headquarters. (See Annex VI—*RFE Editorial Policy Formulation and Program Flow Chart*.) Approximately 1000 leading businessmen serve as volunteer coordinators of the annual financing campaigns of the RFE Fund, Inc. Current National Chairmen of the RFE Fund is Stewart S. Cort, Chairman of Bethlehem Steel who succeeded James M. Roche, Chairman of General Motors (see Annex II—*State Chairmen and Co-Chairmen, RFE Fund, Inc., 1971*). The RFE Fund has benefitted over the past twenty years from the public endorsement of every President from Harry S. Truman to Richard M. Nixon (see Annex IV—*Letter from President Nixon to Chairman of RFE Fund, February 16, 1970*), and from the sponsorship of the Advertising Council. The Council’s public service campaigns on behalf of RFE do not solicit contributions. They are intended solely to inform the American public about the aims and impact of Radio Free Europe and to offer additional information on request (see Annex III—*Sample Print Advertisement, Advertising Council’s 1971 RFE Campaign, and Sample Solicitation Letter, 1971*).

<sup>7</sup> Paul Wohl in *The Christian Science Monitor*, March 13, 1968.

characterized whenever possible by positive treatment illustrating means for remedying the problem under discussion. 'Attractive alternatives', including those of social democratic origin, which offer practical solutions to current and long-range problems should be presented."<sup>8</sup>

#### Programming

About half of RFE's air time is devoted to political programs—news, commentary, and press review. This, as audience research confirms, is by far the most popular commodity RFE has to offer its listeners. The Radio is on the air from dawn to midnight or after to three countries (Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary) and during the most popular listening hours to the others (Rumania and Bulgaria). Average broadcast time to the five countries is about 15 hours a day, as compared to three hours a day by the BBC and two hours a day by the Voice of America. The figures reflect a fundamental difference of purpose: while the other Western broadcasters seek primarily to make available government-sponsored points of view, RFE undertakes to provide the kind of all-round service that an independent, uncensored station might offer within the country.<sup>9</sup>

To make this service comprehensive, to gear it to the particular interests and problems of each target country, and to maintain its standards of accuracy, RFE has developed a news-gathering operation and a research and analysis capacity that are probably without parallel in any other service to East Europe from within or without the area and are widely used by Western scholars, journalists, and government officials who specialize in East European or Communist affairs.<sup>10</sup>

#### RFE—IMPACT

In broad terms, the effect of RFE's programming is twofold—first, it gives sustenance as well as encouragement to the local forces of peaceful reform; and secondly, it provides a mechanism for increasing in those authoritarian systems the public accountability of public officials for their public acts.<sup>11</sup> The evidence of RFE's impact is to be found mainly in the size and structure of RFE's listenership, in the content of its political analysis and commentary, in the political attitudes and listener preferences of the East European populations, in

<sup>8</sup> A Munich daily newspaper recently reviewed a day of RFE's newscasts to Poland and commented:

"What is it that bothers Warsaw most in the broadcasts of Free Europe in the Polish language? . . . It is simply the information, the news, which is being found unpleasant by Moscow's East European allies. One of the sharpest weapons of the rulers there (and of every authoritarian regime) is the information monopoly which is used, above all, for keeping back information. To break this monopoly is probably the Munich radio station's biggest sin. We have had the newscasts broadcast by Free Europe on Tuesday, June 1, in Polish language, translated [into German], and are publishing them on this and the next page in unabridged form: the reader can form a judgment himself whether this is a case of objective reports or not."—*Sueddeutsche Zeitung*, June 9, 1971.

<sup>9</sup> For a detailed description of RFE's programming and cross-reporting, including thumbnail sketches of a week's broadcasts to Poland and a breakdown by country and subject categories see Annex VII—*RFE Programming*.

<sup>10</sup> An idea of the range and depth of RFE's research is provided in Annex VIII—*RFE Research Reports: Index for January 1–March 31, 1971, and Subscribers by Professional Categories*. RFE's research facilities attract visits by numerous scholars, government officials and journalists every year. Nearly 1000 such persons subscribe to RFE's Research Reports. According to a report of October 15, 1970, by the Director of RFE in Munich:

"Since October 1969, RFE has been visited by 91 working newsmen, including representatives of newspapers, periodicals and radio-TV. In the same period we were host to 25 government officials of various nationalities. Twelve scholars paid official visits to RFE during the year, while about double that number made use of our research facilities by telephone, mail, and personal contact with staff members. Distinguished visitors for the period, representing a cross-section of business and professional life, totaled 74. This of course does not include the working newsmen noted above, the U.S. tourist, student and professional groups or the German student and civic groups handled during the year.

"Some journalists spend as much as the better part of a week with us interviewing staffers and otherwise preparing their stories and articles.

"Since the start of this year we have logged 306 requests from journalists and news agencies, 48 requests from government officials or organizations, 46 requests from scholars (as noted above) and 22 from a wide miscellany of sources."

<sup>11</sup> For a detailed study of the relationship between popular aspirations, effective public pressure for change, and the content of RFE commentaries, see Annex IX—*Insight into a Relationship: A Study of the Polish Crisis of 1970–1971 and RFE Broadcasts*. The nature of this inter-relationship is such that the Communist regimes find themselves willy-nilly engaged in dialogues with their own publics and with RFE on a widening range of public issues. For concrete illustrations of this process, see Annex XIX—*Recent Examples of Regime Dialogue with and Response to Specific RFE Broadcasts (1971)*.

letters from listeners,<sup>12</sup> in the published reports of Western journalists, and—perhaps most dramatically—in the nature and extent of regime reaction to RFE output. These are considered below.

#### *Listenership*

In its twenty years of broadcasting to East Europe (Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria), Radio Free Europe appears to have acquired an audience of some 31 million, or half of the population over the age of fourteen.<sup>13</sup>

Continuous and comparative opinion sampling by professional European survey organizations among East European nationals traveling in the West has provided data indicating that a majority of this total are regular listeners (two or three times a week), that young people are becoming a large part of the audience, and that in its area RFE's total listenership is about twice that of VOA or BBC.

The same polling procedures have tended to confirm that this listenership is the result of RFE's opportunity to combine in a single service four characteristics: breadth and accuracy of news and commentary, heavy emphasis on the internal affairs of each target country and of Communist Europe as a whole, variety and appeal of programming, and a wide choice of listening hours from early morning to late at night.

#### *Audience attitudes*

The attitudes of the populations of East Europe, with respect to both their political convictions and their listening preferences, have been scientifically studied over many years and their broad outlines are no longer in dispute among specialists in the West. The very different attitudes of the official establishment in East Europe and the Soviet Union are equally clear, writ large in the actions, public statements, and diplomatic initiatives of top party and government authorities.

In its own effort to obtain a clearer picture of political climates as well as listener preferences in the areas to which it broadcasts, RFE has developed techniques of opinion sampling and analysis based on the views of East European nationals—some 6500 in an average year—who are interviewed while traveling in the West. The field work is conducted for RFE's Audience and Public Opinion Research Department by up to ten independent public opinion research institutes in a number of West European countries. The interviewers are thus not associated with Radio Free Europe. They do not disclose the origin of the questions, and they confine their interviews to those East Europeans who are visiting only temporarily in the West and intend to return to their own country.

Since random samples cannot be directly drawn from the populations concerned, RFE has devised a "corrective and continual sampling" method which provides many independent random and quota samples of the traveling populations taken in different places over extended periods of time. A basic rule of this method stipulates that analysis can be undertaken only if all findings based on such samples agree to a significant extent. These methods have been examined and endorsed by outside specialists, and have been corroborated in other ways.<sup>14</sup>

It appears clear on the basis of such surveys that the populations of East Europe, after two decades of Communist rule, remain "unconvinced of the ideational value of the Communist system and disenchanted with its political practice, People's Democracy. This is particularly true of the young—who

<sup>12</sup> Listeners' letters reach RFE through regime postal censorship at the rate of some 10,000 per year. See Annex X—*RFE Letters from Listeners, 1970*.

<sup>13</sup> See Annex XI—*RFE Listening Trends and Audience Preferences*, and Annex XII—*Oliver Quayle and Company, "An Informal Survey of Opinion Research at Radio Free Europe," October 1970*. The Oliver Quayle report said in part:

"RFE management can take pride and place confidence in this phase of its operation . . . Opinion research procedures at Radio Free Europe are sound. It will be necessary to keep careful check on both the rate of refusal and flow of travellers from each regime. As long as both remain low and high respectively Radio Free Europe and other interested parties can have confidence in survey results. Indeed, we would recommend expanded use of such survey research."

<sup>14</sup> For example, in one case in which it was possible to compare RFE's findings with those of a poll taken within a target country, the similarity of result was striking. In a poll taken among Slovaks in late 1967, RFE found that 66% favored the establishment of a federal system. In February/March 1968—following a considerable increase of public discussion of the subject—the Osvetov Institute in Bratislava found the figure to be 70.4%. See Annex XI—*RFE Listening Trends and Audience Preferences*, and Annex XII—*Oliver Quayle & Co., "An Informal Survey of Opinion Research at Radio Free Europe," October 1970*, cited above.

eventually will determine the future."<sup>15</sup> Other polls taken among Poles, Czechoslovaks, and Hungarians in 1968-1969 showed that if free elections were held, fewer than 5% of the voters would support the Communist Party.

There is, however, no evidence that East Europeans either expect or desire to see violence used in changing their present system. The readiness of the Soviet Union to put down revolt in allied territory was made painfully clear to East Europeans by the events in East Germany in 1953, Hungary in 1956, and Czechoslovakia in 1968, and was later sanctified for international Communism in the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine. The inability of the West to intervene effectively with force, except at the risk of a nuclear confrontation, is equally clear and does not appear to be seriously questioned by East Europeans. The events in Czechoslovakia between January and August of 1968 showed a widespread recognition there of the need for restraint in the face of Soviet apprehensions; the avowed aim of all but a few was not revolution but reform: the establishment of "Communism with a human face", within a continuing framework of one-party rule, Comecon cooperation, and the Soviet alliance. In the light of the power realities in East Europe, the ultimate Soviet reaction to the "Prague Spring" only confirmed the probable inevitability of gradualism—and undoubtedly made it more gradual.

The political profile of East Europe that emerges, then, from the opinion polls and the experience of a generation is that of a relatively sophisticated and frustrated population, devoid of illusion about the relevance of Marxist dogma, reasonably clear about their larger objectives, and well aware that their only hope of achieving them lies in a slow process of peaceful change involving the Soviet society as well as their own. It is a population for whom simplistic polemics would have no utility and no appeal. It is a population, with due allowance for national variations, that is groping for pragmatic, piecemeal solutions, for alternative approaches which their leaders—held back by ideological prejudice, fear of change, or the expectation of Soviet intervention—might be cajoled, shamed, or frightened into trying.

Perhaps nothing has better revealed the direct relationship between conditions within a country and the inhabitants' use of RFE as a surrogate free press than the recent listenership statistics in Czechoslovakia. Between 1963 and 1967, the number of RFE listeners in Czechoslovakia rose from 37% of the adult population to 51%. During that country's brief enjoyment of free speech in the spring and summer of 1968, the figure declined sharply to 34%. In the first month after the Soviet invasion and the reimposition of censorship, listenership rose to a new high of 71% before leveling off at about 65% in 1969.

In a long, critical study of Radio Free Europe, the left-wing Paris weekly *Nouvel Observateur*<sup>16</sup> wrote that "For the listener in the East, it is both American radio and national radio", serving as a "radio-window" toward the East and the listener's own country as well as the West. As such, and being now "more moderate, more reasonable", the article concluded, "its five radios are certainly more dangerous today than they were yesterday for the East European regimes."

#### *Communist regime reactions to RFE*

That the regimes themselves share this estimate is clear from their own innumerable public comments. There is, however, nothing new about the fact of regime hostility toward Radio Free Europe.

In the early days, all five countries jammed RFE's frequencies. While jamming was later given up by three of the five—apparently on the judgment that the spotty results did not justify the political and other costs—Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia continue to jam RFE.<sup>17</sup>

Throughout the organization's twenty years, the leaders and press of East Europe have sought to deter listening also by means of public denunciation. They have lavished virtually the full range of standard Communist invective on Radio Free Europe, a poisonous center of espionage and global warfare manned

<sup>15</sup> *Attitudes Toward Key Political Concepts in East Europe*, a report by the Audience and Public Opinion Research Department of Radio Free Europe, Munich, December 1969.

<sup>16</sup> January 12, 1970. Full text included in Annex XIII—*Representative Reporting and Comment on RFE by Western Media, 1970-1971*, in Section entitled "West Europe".

<sup>17</sup> Both the jamming and a growing interference from neighboring broadcast frequencies operated by other international broadcasters has led to a steady erosion in the technical quality of RFE's signal. To cope with this problem, RFE should undertake soon a long-deferred program of transmitter modernization and other capital improvements.

by bourgeois-imperialist propagandists, revisionist-deviationist provocateurs, and even criminal-degenerate conspirators.

In 1956 the Soviet Union led a more sophisticated effort to discredit Radio Free Europe by charging that its broadcasts had instigated the Hungarian revolution. It was an allegation that, like the name-calling, had no visible effect on the peoples of East Europe, although it made a lasting impression on some in the West, notwithstanding the fact that the charge was independently investigated and publicly dismissed by the Adenauer government.<sup>18</sup> The Council of Europe<sup>19</sup> and *The New York Times*<sup>20</sup> reached similar conclusions at that time.

While the myth is still nurtured and the name-calling continues unabated, however, the character of regime reactions to Radio Free Europe in recent years has undergone a highly significant change.

Today the regimes publicly acknowledge that Radio Free Europe—and other Western media, which they increasingly lump together with RFE—are creating political problems that cannot be dispelled by mere incantation. They are convening conferences of their leading editors and writers to determine what kinds of counter-measures might be adopted. They have taken steps, and rejected others, designed to make their programming more competitive with that of Radio Free Europe. And they have even begun to answer in public substantive points made in various RFE commentaries.

This new kind of reaction to RFE's broadcasts has been accompanied by, and may help to explain, certain other developments: a sharp increase in the number of specific public attacks on Radio Free Europe—they have been running at about 1000 a year since 1968—and, for the first time, the direct and active participation of Soviet media in the campaign against the Radio.<sup>21</sup>

The cumulative import of such data can hardly be in doubt. As the *Nouvel Observateur* put it in the article previously cited: "... No other station in the world, American or other, exercises such influence direct or indirect on the public opinion of five countries."<sup>22</sup> By at least October 1968, according to a leading

<sup>18</sup> Chancellor Adenauer, press conference of January 25, 1957. For text of *New York Times* and International News Service dispatches, see Annex XVI—*RFE and the Hungarian Uprising of 1956*.

<sup>19</sup> Consultative Assembly, Council of Europe, *Report of Committee on Non-Represented Nations*, Strasbourg, April 27, 1957. Text in Annex XVI (cited in footnote 1).

<sup>20</sup> Editorial, December 15, 1956. See Annex XVI (cited in footnote 1) for complete text.

<sup>21</sup> See Annex XIV—*The Coordination of Soviet and East European Attacks on Radio Free Europe and Chronology of a Soviet and East European Campaign to Oust Radio Free Europe from West Germany (During One Six-Month Period: November 1, 1970 through April 30, 1971)*. See also Annex XX—*The New Character of Communist Reactions to RFE Broadcasts*.

The Soviet and East European official campaign against RFE reached a peak on May 26, 1971 when Poland delivered notes of protest to the governments of the German Federal Republic and the United States. The West German government has repeatedly denied reports that it was planning to revoke RFE's license to broadcast. The most recent official statement was issued June 9 in response to a parliamentary interpellation from Werner Marx, Chairman of the Foreign Policy Working Committee of the CDU. His question was: "Has the Federal Government made unmistakably clear to the Polish Government that it regards the demand by the Polish Foreign Minister to proceed against Radio Free Europe as an inadmissible interference in our affairs and as a not helpful contribution toward German-Polish understanding, and that it continues to be interested in letting the mentioned station broadcast news and commentaries for the peoples of Eastern Europe freely and without interference?"

In response, Karl Moersch, State Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said the complaint was being studied and would be answered in due course. He added, in part: "The Polish side has been informed of our opinion on this question for a long time. . . . The authority of the Federal Republic of Germany over radio stations located on its territory is limited constitutionally. . . . This applies to German radio stations as well as to Radio Free Europe. This station as well is protected by the right to freedom of opinion. We have, however, declared ourselves willing to accept justified complaints about programs from Radio Free Europe and to discuss these with the authorities at the Munich station."

<sup>22</sup> Most Western journalists who have taken the time to visit RFE's broadcast center in Munich and to study the operation in detail have reached similar conclusions. Robert S. Elegant of the *Los Angeles Times* wrote recently:

"Attacks in the West against RFE and Radio Liberty are levelled by the wrong people for the wrong reasons. They should come from the political neanderthals who still want to 'roll back the Iron Curtain' by encouraging revolt in Communist countries. Cold warriors, dedicated to destroying the Communists by insurrection or war, could object to both stations' 'soft line'."

"Ironically, most attacks come from men of good will who champion free exchange of information and want to end the cold war. Although their performances are hardly perfect, both stations seek those same purposes."

"True liberals should, therefore, support the stations' aims: free information and East-West relaxation. Fundamental rapprochement between East and West is im-

Polish official, it was time to "give up once and for all the pretense that nothing is going on. We must give it up and treat these propaganda media as a real political force which reaches within our country."<sup>23</sup>

The official added that in all likelihood as time went on, the "oppositional" or "disintegrative" forces within the country would increasingly find ways to support and exploit these foreign information media. This refrain has been echoed repeatedly by top East European leaders, including Bulgarian Prime Minister and Party Chief Todor Zhivkov, whose recent comment also revealed some typical party thinking about possible remedies for their current ideological credibility gap:

"... These difficulties are the result of untimely and incorrect explanations of the policy of the party, of weaknesses in the field of our political and ideological work under the influence of the ideologically disorienting and confusing activities of imperialist propaganda... We have decisively to overcome the underestimating of the importance of this front and to increase our vigilance and our ideological firmness; we must also mobilize all our efforts to raise the Communist education of our people and particularly of our youth to a higher level."<sup>24</sup>

Czechoslovak Party Chief Gustav Husak, who has probably given Radio Free Europe more free publicity in his public utterances than any other Communist leader, complained similarly in his inaugural address that there were "many connections" between foreign propaganda and "rightist tendencies" within the country, and added:

"... If one reads the monitoring of Radio Free Europe, one finds the same things, the same way of speaking, and frequently the same terminology as one does in the writings of some of our publicists."<sup>25</sup>

From the point of view of the regimes, as the Director of the Polish Party Central Committee's education department has pointed out, there is a serious inconvenience in the intellectual rapport that now clearly exists between RFE and its listeners; namely that:

"... Even insignificant troubles caused by reactionary forces may be given great importance... The danger of each hostile action can no longer be measured by the force and extent of the local group which starts that particular move. It must be multiplied by the power of the facilities for ideological subversion available abroad, as well as by certain elements of our own weakness."<sup>26</sup>

Indeed, the combination of the rapport prevailing between RFE and its listeners, and the multiplier effect of radio communication, has created what might be called a new dilemma of accountability for East Europe's Communist leadership.

A former Polish Communist official, in a manuscript originally submitted for publication in Warsaw but ultimately published in Paris by the Polish-language magazine *Kultura*, commented on this dilemma with unusual frankness:

"It can be safely said that the centers of foreign, inimical propaganda are only taking advantage of our mistakes, our inability to understand and solve the problem of information under conditions of the second half of the XXth Century.

possible as long as insecure Eastern governments must rule by physical and psychological repression.

"Both RFE and Radio Liberty discuss the problem of peaceful evolution in Communist societies in language immediately comprehensible to generations trained in the intellectual discipline of Marxism. Both note—and criticize—the faults of the West, as well as of the East... simple. Neither tensions within Communist society nor tension between East and West would miraculously disappear if both stations went off the air tomorrow. Tensions might actually intensify because of frustrating lack of information.

"Both stations are byproducts—not causes—of fundamental tensions. Despite their human imperfections, both seek to reduce internal and international tension by the best means yet known to man."—*Long Island Press*, March 22, 1971.

For complete texts of this and other articles, see Annex XIII—*Representative Reporting and Comment on RFE by Western Media, 1970-71*.

<sup>23</sup> Jerzy Solecki, Chief of Polish agency Interpress, in *Warsaw Literary Gazette*, October 1968.

<sup>24</sup> Speech in Sofia, April 19, 1970.

<sup>25</sup> Speech before the Central Committee, April 17, 1969. The statement was also of interest for its reference to monitoring. It is known that official agencies in all five countries monitor and distribute RFE broadcast material daily to government and party leaders and to selected editors and journalists of the official media. In his report to the Party Congress on May 25, 1971, Husak complained once more about the "slandering campaigns of the bourgeois press and the so-called Radio Free Europe and other propaganda channels of imperialism..."

<sup>26</sup> Symposium on Impact of RFE, published in the Warsaw *Miesiecznik Literacki*, October 1968.

It is astounding and at the same time alarming how far the influence of this foreign propaganda extends (represented chiefly by 'Free Europe'), not only over society but over our authorities. With the progressive atrophy of social and political reflection, further dried up by the systematically expanded impact of our censorship, this propaganda (it is a shame to admit) to a large extent fulfills the role of an opposition journal, the struggle against which is becoming an important stream of ideological life for our propaganda apparatus. What is more, these foreign sources are capable of imposing on us action in the field of domestic policy, influence appraisals of individual phenomena, and even our personal policies."<sup>27</sup>

Here, in fact, lies the acid test of effective West-to-East communication in the 1970s. It should not be enough to demonstrate virtuous performance in the service of virtuous objectives. Nor should it be enough to show merely that over the past twenty years there has been some movement in the audience area toward greater independence, less internal repression, and better relations with the West. What matters is whether the instrument has made itself a functioning part of contemporary historical processes within East Europe, and whether it has done so in a manner which, if continued, will support basic Western purposes.

Communist propaganda cannot today operate in a vacuum, because Western media have moved in to fill that vacuum. In East Europe—by default, and often by their own admission—the regimes and their media have made Radio Free Europe an active participant in the daily dialogue between people and party. In a steady widening and deepening of that dialogue lies the only realistic prospect of continued, non-violent movement in East Europe toward those objective conditions that must underlie meaningful detente between East and West.<sup>28</sup>

THE FOLLOWING ANNEXES TO THIS STATEMENT HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED TO AND ARE ON FILE WITH THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

I. Officers, Directors and Members of the Corporation of Free Europe, Inc. and Radio Free Europe Fund, Inc.

II. State Chairmen and Co-Chairmen, RFE Fund, Inc., 1971.

III. Sample Print Advertisement, Advertising Council's 1971 RFE Campaign, and Sample Solicitation Letter, 1971.

<sup>27</sup> Wladyslaw Blenkowski, "Positive and Negative Forces of Communism", December 1969. Cf. Zbigniew Brzezinski, "Communists on Communism", in *Newsweek*, May 4, 1970, p. 60.

<sup>28</sup> Writing in the London *Daily Telegraph* of June 7, 1971, Anatoli Kuznetsov quotes from the Soviet newspaper *Komsomolskaya Pravda* of May 29, 1971, to show the kind of pressure which Radio Liberty's and Radio Free Europe's broadcasting exert on the Communist press itself:

"The reports which we publish [said the Pravda editorial] must deal more frankly with the unfavorable features and developments in our society. It is always better for us to analyze them ourselves than to wait for commentaries by various 'voices' (i.e., foreign radio stations) which reach our public in one way or the other, directly or by roundabout means. Our reports on events in the West should be less superficial. Talk of the 'bared teeth of savage imperialism' fails to impress many people in these days. We must go more deeply into things for our young people."

The same point was made by the Hungarian government daily *Magyar Hirlap* on March 3, 1971:

"All in all, it is undeniable that we can learn even from the methods of RFE: namely [we must provide] still more publicity, still more stimuli for thinking, and still more published facts."

<sup>29</sup> "It is not surprising that the communist rulers should resent the freedom enjoyed by these two stations to broadcast their programmes uncensored direct to the peoples of the communist world. Their pained reaction is a sure sign of the effectiveness of their broadcasts."

"It is alarming, however, that influential peoples in the West should find it possible to contemplate restricting the work which Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe have done with skill and responsibility for so long."

"For the great majority of the people in the censorridden communist world broadcasting is the only means the West has of conducting a dialogue with them. Despite the measures taken by communist governments to prevent the broadcasts being heard there is much evidence that the present audiences can be counted in millions."

"Opponents of broadcasting to the communist world often depict it as a reversion to the 'cold war'."

"I know from long personal experience that both the Europeans and the Americans responsible for running Radio Free Europe are extremely well informed, balanced in their judgments and in no sense fanatical crusaders. On the contrary, they are people who have been working for years to bring about true understanding."—Letter by Hugh Seton-Watson, Professor of Russian History, London University School of Slavonic and East European Studies, in the London *Daily Telegraph*, June 9, 1971.

- IV. Letter from President Nixon to Chairman of RFE Fund, February 16, 1970.
- V. The West European Advisory Committee of Radio Free Europe.
- VI. RFE Editorial Policy Formulation and Program Flow Chart.
- VII. RFE Programming.
- VIII. RFE Research Reports: Index for January 1-March 31, 1971, and Subscribers by Professional Categories.
- IX. Insight into a Relationship: A Study of the Polish Crisis of 1970-1971 and RFE Broadcasts.
- X. RFE Letters from Listeners, 1970.
- XI. RFE Listening Trends and Audience Preferences.
- XII. Oliver Quayle and Company, "An Informal Survey of Opinion Research at Radio Free Europe", October 1970.
- XIII. Representative Reporting and Comment on RFE by Western Media, 1970-1971.
- XIV. The Coordination of Soviet and East European Attacks on Radio Free Europe; and Chronology of a Soviet and East European Campaign to Oust Radio Free Europe from West Germany (during one 6-month period: November 1, 1970 through April 30, 1971).
- XV. External Broadcasting by Communist Countries.
- XVI. RFE and the Hungarian Uprising of 1956.
- XVII. Recent Developments and the Current Political Scene in the Soviet Union and East Europe.
- XVIII. Social Forces and Trends in East Europe.
- XIX. Recent Examples of Regime Dialogue with and Response to Specific Broadcasts.
- XX. The New Character of Communist Reaction to RFE Broadcasts.

---

STATEMENT BY THE RADIO LIBERTY COMMITTEE, INC., SUBMITTED BY HOWLAND  
H. SARGEANT, PRESIDENT

RADIO LIBERTY: AN UNCENSORED INFORMATION MEDIUM FOR SOVIET CITIZENS  
ROLE AND UNDERLYING CONCEPT

"There is no freedom of the press in Russia, but who can say there is no freedom of thought?"—Alexander Yesenin-Volpin, Soviet mathematician.

"Public recognition of the facts, complete and honest, is the first condition of health in all societies, including our own."—Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

"The division of mankind faces it with destruction. . . . In the face of these perils, any action increasing the division of mankind, any preaching of the incompatibility of world ideologies and nations is madness and a crime."—Andrei Sakharov, "Father of the Soviet H-Bomb"

Radio Liberty broadcasts have been the channel through which many Soviet citizens have learned of statements like these by their distinguished fellow-countrymen. Short-wave radio from abroad is the only mass medium available for dissemination of such material inside the Soviet Union.

MIT's Ithiel de Sola Pool, distinguished behavioral scientists and America's foremost expert on the diffusion of information in the Soviet Union, has stated categorically that "most of the things of a positive character that are happening in the Soviet Union today are explainable only in terms of the influence of the West for which the most important single channel is radio. . . . There is now enough communication to keep us part of a single civilization, to keep us influencing each other, to assure that any Western idea circulates in the Soviet Union too. The pessimistic expectation that totalitarianism could develop and accepted heinous civilization of its own by 1984 or any other year has been defeated primarily by the forces of communication and above all, by international radio." (For other comments on Radio Liberty by recognized authorities, see Appendix)

Although all western stations broadcasting to the Soviet Union contribute to this effect, Radio Liberty's role is unique. Contrary to charges that it is a holdover from the cold war, already in 1953 RL's emigre Council of Editors endorsed a policy calling for the presentation of "positive alternatives" to the Soviet system, couched in a friendly tone and, for the most part, by indirection—for example, by explaining the workings of democratic systems in terms understandable

to Soviet citizens. RL has unquestionably influenced the growth of the civil rights movement in the USSR including that remarkable development of recent years, "samizdat"—the circulation of typewritten copy of documents examining Russia's past, present and possible evolution in the future.

Radio Liberty is a communications channel for Soviet citizens concerned about their country's future, and its place in the world community. It is dedicated to human rights, to peaceful evolution of Soviet society and to harmony in international relations.

Radio Liberty speaks in Russian and 16 languages of the Soviet Union's other nationalities. (Non-Russians now make up nearly one-half of the total population.)

How does Radio Liberty differ from other voices broadcasting to the USSR?

1. Many documents broadcast by Radio Liberty originate *inside* the Soviet Union. (During the first quarter of 1971, documents written in the USSR made up one-sixth of the RL Russian program, and the proportion has been increasing since then.)

2. Among the station's key broadcasters are former Soviet citizens, some of them intellectuals prominent until recently in Soviet life. Voices heard over Radio Liberty have included Svetlana Aliluyeva and the Stalin Prize-winning novelist Anatoly Kuznetsov.

3. Radio Liberty focuses on Soviet domestic interests. It speaks especially to the growing numbers of Soviet citizens now being led by their education and the nature of their responsibilities to seek new answers for their country's problems in an era of rising expectations fostered by technological progress.

4. In discussing international questions, Radio Liberty reflects the point of view of people in the Soviet Union, including prominent scientists and writers, who wish an end to the Cold War, who call for ideological as well as military co-existence, for disarmament and international co-operation in dealing with hunger, disease and other ills of mankind.

Radio Liberty does not issue appeals for action. It seeks merely to help in forming an enlightened Soviet public opinion.

The concept of Radio Liberty owes much of its original inspiration to the late Boris Shub, who was a staff advisor during the station's early years. In his book *The Choice*, published in 1950, Shub summed up the conviction gained from his encounters with Soviet citizens during and after World War II: "If we return, while there is still time, to our wartime alliance with the Russian people against aggressive totalitarian tyranny, we will destroy war before war destroys us. For without peace between the United States and Russia, disaster for all will come. . . ."

Speaking of the tradition of Russia's great 19th century humanitarians, Shub called for:

" . . . restoring to the Russian people the true thread of their own history and traditions, disentangling the knots, helping them to mobilize the great spiritual and moral resources that lie within them. We must saturate Russia with the truth about Russian history, appealing to the legitimate pride of the Russian people in the best that is in them . . . in the liberating message of their great literature, in the words and deeds of the men and women who fought, spoke, and died for freedom, who interpreted the best in the Russian spirit to the world and brought the world closer to Russia."

In the more than two decades since Shub wrote these words, significant and hopeful changes have taken place in the USSR. One of them is the continuing rise of education.

#### *The spread of Soviet education*

Radio Liberty is dedicated to a concept vital to Soviet-American relations: that the future of the Soviet Union rests with that country's fast-growing group of intellectuals and professionals as much as it does with the aging Party bureaucracy presently wielding power.

The spread of education in Soviet society was noted by the columnist Joseph Kraft during a recent visit to Moscow. Writing in the *New Yorker*, Mr. Kraft commented on the latest Soviet census figures:

" . . . In education, particularly, there was an impressive rise. Those in the working force with a college degree more than doubled from 1959 to 1970. Those with a vocational-high-school education rose from 6.6 million in 1959 to 12.1 million in 1970. The number with more than an eighth-grade education rose from forty-three million in 1959 to seventy-five million in 1970.

Contrasting with this growth in intellectual resources is the fact that the Soviet Union's basic political institutions have not changed since Stalin consolidated his power in the 1920's and 1930's. One constant has been censorship.

*Facts about censorship*

The dependence of Soviet citizens on foreign radio broadcasts stems from the special conditions in which they still live 18 years after Stalin's death:

1. The borders of the Soviet Union are sealed to those *inside* by armed guards, barbed wire and electronic detection devices. Only citizens with a special security clearance are allowed to travel abroad, usually in supervised groups. As a rule, citizens going abroad are required to leave behind a family member as hostage for their return.

2. A Soviet citizen who leaves his country without official permission is held guilty of treason and, if caught, is liable to a criminal penalty up to and including death by shooting. Simas Kudirka, the Lithuanian seaman who recently tried unsuccessfully to defect from a Soviet fishing vessel, received a sentence of ten years at hard labor.

3. All information and communications media in the country are tightly controlled by the higher organs of the Communist Party. Even ownership of mimeograph machines and other reproducing equipment is limited by law to official institutions, where they are kept under lock and key.

4. Citizens in one part of the country can learn through news media of events in another part of the country only after the news has passed through central censorship. (In American terms of reference, this is as if people in California could find out about events in Colorado only after the news had been censored in Washington.)

5. Works of history, and the writings of leading historical figures, are either distorted or suppressed entirely. Since 1964, Nikita Khrushchev has been named only a handful of times by official media. No speech or letter by Leon Trotsky, the founder of the Red Army, is available to Soviet citizens. The works of Alexander Herzen and many classic humanist liberals of the last century are censored. (In American terms of reference, this is as if the writings of men like Franklin, Paine, Jefferson and Thoreau were banned or existed only in versions doctored to fit the policies of the present government.)

6. News from abroad, like all other news, passes through the filter of censorship. Citizens can obtain foreign books, magazines and newspapers (except for a few Communist publications) only by special permission.

7. All mail going in and out of the country is subject to censorship. Contacts with foreign visitors are carefully controlled.

Western observers of Soviet affairs have frequently pointed out that the purpose of such ideological controls is twofold: (1) to instill in Soviet citizens the conviction that their system is superior to all others and (2) to make it possible to mobilize public opinion against countries outside the Soviet bloc. (Professor Pool of MIT and others have noted that while censorship remains total, censors have been obliged in the face of competition from foreign broadcasts to let more of the truth slip into official media in recent years.)

Addressing the recent Party Congress in Moscow, Leonid Brezhnev declared that "we live in conditions of unremitting ideological warfare . . ." He also stated: "Under conditions of continuing subversive activity by imperialism, an important role is played by the *organs of state security*. During the reporting period they have been reinforced with politically mature personnel."

A typical example of this "unremitting ideological warfare" was described two weeks before the Brezhnev speech in a *New York Times* report by Tad Szulc headlined "A Soviet Magazine Distorts Book by Justice Douglas":

"A Soviet academic periodical has portrayed Associate Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court as an 'apostle of liberalism' who has lost his faith in democracy in a censored and distorted version of his latest book.

"Presented as an 'abridged version' of Justice Douglas's book, 'Points of Rebellion,' two articles in September's and October's issue of *USA* placed his views out of context through elimination of all passages that praised life in the United States.

"The Russian-language magazine of the Soviet Academy of Sciences deals with American affairs. The articles were printed without permission of the author or the American publisher, Random House, Inc., which brought out the book in 1969.

"A comparison between the texts of Justice Douglas's book and the Soviet version showed that more than 40 per cent of the material was deleted in the magazine, including all references to the constitutional rights of Americans, the right of dissent in the United States, and even rates paid American workers." (See Annex "A.1" for complete text)

Soviet censors have altered Russian translations of such other American works as Norman Mailer's *Miami and the Siege of Chicago*, Truman Capote's *In Cold Blood* or Bel Kaufman's *Up the Down Staircase*, to make them present less favorable pictures of American life. In the case of *Up the Down Staircase*, the censor added a passage of his own to the original text, putting into the mouth of one of the characters a Soviet denunciation of American life.

#### *The "Samizdat" phenomenon*

Censorship of Soviet domestic reality is no less blatant.

In his book *The Russians*, written after he came to the West in 1966, the former Soviet journalist Leonid Vladimirov (now a full-time Radio Liberty staffer) summed up censorship in this way:

"Not a single thing can be printed in the Soviet Union, whether it be a book or a postage stamp, a newspaper or a label for a bottle, a magazine or a candy-wrapper, unless it has been approved by the censor. No radio transmission is beamed, no public exhibition is opened for public view until an official stamp has approved it."

The response of hard-pressed Soviet intellectuals has been a unique phenomenon: "*samizdat*" (literally "self-publishing"). This is an amazing collection of painstakingly copied, unpublished manuscripts which circumvent the censor.

*Samizdat* participants risk arrest and imprisonment. Usually, *samizdat* is reproduced on a typewriter, with multiple carbons. The first two copies are often destroyed, to keep the typewriter from being traced.

The number of *samizdat* items to reach the West is fast approaching 1,000. Included are everything from book-length works to articles, to appeals and protests consisting of only a page or two. The contents are varied: major literary writings, some of them by noted Soviet authors; thoughtful essays by top specialists dealing with political, social and economic problems; "transcripts" of courtroom trials from which the public has been barred; and individual or group petitions by Soviet citizens seeking redress of grievances. *Samizdat* has even produced an official free press, the typewritten "Chronicle of Current Events," of which nineteen issues have already appeared at bimonthly intervals.

Very little *samizdat* is "revolutionary" in tone. The emphasis is on reform, and the tone is nearly always restrained and businesslike.

Radio Liberty is the major channel for rebroadcasting *samizdat* back to the Soviet Union. As a non-governmental voice which stresses the domestic interests of its exclusively Soviet audience, Radio Liberty is able to devote far more air-time to comprehensive *samizdat* coverage than any other broadcaster. In a recent month, the station devoted 80 hours in Russian, not counting multiple repeat programs, to *samizdat*. (This was more than the total Russian output of most other broadcasters.) During the first quarter of 1971, as noted earlier, one-sixth of Radio Liberty's Russian program originated from writers inside the Soviet Union who were able in this way to reach a mass audience of their fellow countrymen.

Radio transmission of *samizdat* has given rise to a related phenomenon: *magnitizdat* (literally, "tape-publishing"). This derives from the practice of preserving *samizdat* broadcasts on home tape recorders, whose ownership is now common. *Magnitizdat* has even appeared on the black market: a Radio Liberty listener reported that the station's broadcasts of Svetlana Alliluyeva's book "Twenty Letters to a Friend" were selling for from 70 to 120 rubles (\$77 to \$132), the price depending on the quality of reception.

Still another source of Radio Liberty broadcasts is "*tamizdat*" ("there-publishing"), consisting of works by Russian authors originally published in the West. Obviously, *tamizdat* often overlaps with *samizdat*.

A Russian writer prominent in the human-rights movement until his departure from the USSR earlier this year has written to Radio Liberty that:

"The more determined and stubborn begin seeking out truthful information—they are potential readers of *samizdat*: the more cautious prefer so-called "oral" *samizdat*, ranging from retelling what they have heard (in particular from Radio Liberty) to anecdotes on social political themes.

"Of course, *samizdat* owes its very existence to the totalitarian regime. Moreover, the years of the Soviet regime have long since accustomed people to seeking out information by themselves, without witnesses (it is safer that way), and consequently many people who have never laid hands on a typescript page of *samizdat* are not at all badly informed about both fiction and publicistic literature, thanks to Russian-language broadcasts from abroad.

"In other words, there is a certain merging of those who come into direct contact with *samizdat* with those who have only indirect access to it (for, as we know, Radio Liberty reflects *samizdat* works in one form or another)."

#### *Response to samizdat broadcasts*

The role of Western radio in providing Soviet citizens with a mass medium through which to reach their fellow-countrymen has been well documented. In *samizdat* itself there are frequent references to such broadcasts, as well as appeals to Western broadcasters to continue their role.

Shortly before his imprisonment, I. A. Yakhimovich, a former Latvian collective-farm chairman who publicly denounced the invasion of Czechoslovakia, wrote an "open letter" to Academician Sakharov, the "father of the Soviet H-bomb," whose *samizdat* appeal for a more peaceful and rational Soviet policy had been broadcast extensively by Radio Liberty. Yakhimovich wrote: "... Academician Sakharov, I have heard your '*Meditations* ...' Sorry I didn't get a chance to reply to them. The debt is mine. ..." In turn, Yakhimovich's "open letter" was also broadcast.

Yuri Galanskov, author of the *samizdat* "Organizational Problems of the Movement for Full and Universal Disarmament," made this reference in an appeal on behalf of imprisoned dissenters:

"... Through a happy combination of circumstances, such events as the hunger strike in February, 1968, the 'Letter of Six,' and the collective hunger strike in behalf of A. Ginzburg sooner or later became known both inside the country and abroad. The latter circumstance is the most important and telling one from the standpoint of our national interests. The Western press, and especially Western radio in the Russian language, give wide currency to facts of arbitrary judicial actions and administrative perversion, pinpoint their social nature, and force the state organs and officialdom to take urgent measures. This overcomes the natural inertia and conservatism of the bureaucracy. ... In functioning like this, Western press and radio perform the tasks of an organized opposition which is presently lacking in Russia, and thus stimulate our national development. ..."

The Dutch scholar Professor Karel van het Reve, a specialist in Soviet affairs who knows the Moscow *samizdat* scene at first hand, has had this comment:

"... A third question, also often heard is: Should one not refrain from publishing these underground manuscripts in the West because of the harm such publication might do to their authors? The answer to this question is, in my opinion—and I may add, in the opinion of the underground writers—emphatically No: one should not refrain from publishing. These people want to be *read* and *heard*. It is their only way to reach that part of the "listening" public of the Soviet Union that has no access to *samizdat* and therefore has to rely solely on what is read to them (sometimes at dictation speed) by foreign radio stations broadcasting in Russian. When Larissa Daniel and Pavel Litvinov gave their "Appeal to World Public Opinion" to Western journalists on 11 January 1968, they did so because it was the only way to reach the Soviet public quickly and effectively: within 24 hours news of their appeal had reached every corner of the Soviet empire."

Radio Liberty is the station referred to by Professor van het Reve as regularly broadcasting important *samizdat* documents at dictation-speed.

Numerous Moscow correspondents of Western news media have commented on the role of Radio Liberty and other stations in disseminating *samizdat*. On December 13, 1970 the Washington *Post* printed a dispatch from its Moscow correspondent containing the following paragraph:

"They (dissenters) therefore make a point of telling Western correspondents the facts they have been able to confirm. Not all are worth a news story, but when they are, the dissenters know the information will be broadcast back by foreign radio stations, like Radio Liberty and the Voice of America, that transmit reports in Russian based on the correspondents' dispatches—the easiest, quickest way that people here learn about events. Dissidents also have their own ways of getting documents abroad that correspondents know nothing about."

(A Swiss newspaper's comments on Radio Liberty *samizdat* broadcasts are contained in the article reproduced as Annex "I.2.")

A Soviet Jew prominent in dissent circles until he left the country earlier this year (anonymous here because of relatives in the USSR) described the role of *samizdat* broadcasts from his personal experience:

EXHIBIT

LEWIS S. FEUER, PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

... the diffusion of the information and ideas contained in the *samizdat* publications is not measured only by the relatively few thousands of people who actually see them. For their audience is multiplied several thousandfold through foreign radio broadcasts, especially those of Radio Liberty in Munich. There are about 86,500,000 radio sets in the Soviet Union according to government statistics, and of these an estimated 27,000,000 are believed capable of receiving short-wave broadcasts from abroad. Even allowing for exaggeration and defective equipment, we may still estimate that millions of Russians have access to Western broadcasts. During the last year, Radio Liberty has been reading the contents of *samizdat* publications over the air to the Soviet people. The letters of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn denouncing literary censorship; the proceedings of the trials of Andrei Siniavsky and Yuli Daniel, Yuri Galanskov and Aleksandr Ginzburg, Pavel Litvinov, and many other dissidents; and the host of appeals and petitions demanding respect for the constitutional rights of Soviet citizens all these and more have been made known to a much broader segment of the Soviet population through the Radio Liberty broadcasts (the announcers often speaking slowly enough to permit their words to be written down or taped).

Thus *samizdat* is now reinforced by what has come to be called *radizdat*. As one Western observer has written, the publications and documents of the Russian opposition which find their way abroad now "become known to Soviet radio listeners from Minsk to Vladivostok." Indeed, when *Izvestia* alluded to the "well-known" trial of Galanskov and his circle, it was conceding that, despite the failure of the Soviet press to report it, the broadcasts from abroad about the trial had reached the Russian people.—"The Intelligentsia in Opposition" *Problems of Communism* Vol. XIX, No. 6, Nov. Dec. 1970, p. 10.

"... If I want to say something to the people, to the country, then the only way I can say it is through Western radio. And people all understand that that is merely a method of speaking to the country, you see ..."

Last February a Moscow correspondent of United Press International filed a story on a new *samizdat* publication, *Veche*, which was reported on by Radio Liberty in its newscast. The editor of *Veche*, believing the UPI report to be inaccurate, quickly issued a correction of some of the information in it, citing the Radio Liberty broadcast. The correction circulated in *samizdat*, and Radio Liberty was soon able to broadcast it as well.

A compilation of quotations from *samizdat* appears in Annex "D.4."

*Beyond samizdat broadcasts*

The elaborate Soviet censorship system represents a determined effort to isolate citizens from internal sources of knowledge and inspiration, as well as from all outside influence. In the Soviet Union, words are the chief articles of contraband. The situation described more than twenty years ago by Boris Shub in *The Choice* remains much the same: a large part of the country's pre-revolutionary political and cultural heritage is still eradicated from the record, as it was in Stalin's day. Censorship of revolutionary and post-revolutionary history is even more trenchant: most of the major figures of the past 50 years, men like Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, Bukharin, Rykov, Molotov, Malenkov, appear not at all or in fleeting references, usually to their villainy. The wrongs of the Stalin period have been brought to light only in scattered fragments: they contain too many lessons for the present.

The works of leading writers and poets of the Soviet period, Pilnyak, Zamiatin, Mandelstam or Gumilev, are still relegated to oblivion. Even domestic current events are passed through a highly selective filter, with official media limiting their coverage to "positive" developments. The broadcasts of Radio Liberty (which deal in large part with Soviet domestic affairs) and, since 1968, those of VOA and BBC meet with continuous interference from hundreds of jamming stations.

Such primitive methods of thought-control are a major focus of dissent for the Soviet citizens most affected by them: scientists, writers, and other intellectual and professional groups. It is no accident that these groups have been in the forefront of the Soviet Union's budding movement for human rights. But the quest for new solutions to political, economic and social problems is not limited to those who risk open dissent; it cuts deeply into all walks of Soviet society, as shown by various attitudinal studies.

Shortly after the Soviet invasion of his country in August 1968, the Czech philosopher Dr. Ivan Svitak commented:

"The intervention was not against a nation of 14 million, but against the Russian intellectuals. Our hope for change is within the Soviet Union; that will be the end of Soviet imperialism. . . . The invasion of Czechoslovakia was an act of fear by the Soviet bureaucratic and military elite against their own intelligentsia, against their own people. . . . (Quoted by Anatole Shub in "An Empire Loses Hope"; see Annex "B")

In addition to broadcasting samizdat, Radio Liberty seeks to satisfy the Soviet citizen's thirst for knowledge through its own programs on topics of importance.

Radio Liberty broadcasts substitute reasons for emotion, and a calm voice for stridency. Russians, Ukrainians, Uzbeks and staff-members of other nationalities have absorbed the objective criteria of professional journalism, Western style. They have learned that the most convincing presentation is the one that tells all sides of the story. Radio Liberty recruits writers with specialized training, and in some cases has financed further study for personnel. A total of 19 staff-members (in all branches of the Radio Liberty Committee) hold doctoral degrees, and 41 have other advanced degrees. Many others are currently working for postgraduate degrees. In Radio Liberty's work the advice—and creative contribution—of outside academic specialists in Soviet affairs and communications have played a major part.

The terms "Cold War broadcaster" and "propaganda station," sometimes applied to Radio Liberty in the press, are misleading. The concept of Radio Liberty goes far beyond the narrow one of propaganda; it is based on the belief that the Soviet leadership, if confronted by a truly informed public opinion, will tend to behave more moderately and sensibly. It upholds the basic right of the whole Soviet public to know the whole truth about any question.

Radio Liberty's broadcasts on domestic themes are positive and tactful in tone. They take various forms:

1. Items of "hard news" about internal developments not carried by general regime media; these are gleaned by Radio Liberty from many sources, including the reports of Western correspondents, from monitoring of regional radio broadcasts, or from expert analysis of Soviet publications.
2. Analytical, non-polemical commentaries on Soviet internal affairs by qualified specialists.
3. "Cross-reporting" of developments in other, more liberal Communist countries.
4. Information demonstrating how non-Communist countries face problems relevant to those of the Soviet Union.
5. Programs which fill in the gaps in official Soviet histories, stressing democratic elements in the political heritage of Russians or other Soviet nationalities and the positive and negative aspects of earlier periods of Soviet rule. These programs draw heavily on suppressed documents and historical writings, as in recent fiftieth anniversary broadcasts on The Kronstadt sailors' movement.
6. Programs which supply "missing pages" in the cultural heritage of the audience; these derive from pre-revolutionary, post-revolutionary and emigre sources.

For current Soviet topics, Radio Liberty refers regularly to the work of academic and journalistic commentators on Soviet affairs, primarily Americans or Western Europeans. Radio Liberty also reports developments of special relevance to its listeners in the natural and social sciences, public administration, the arts, etc. Radio Liberty programs reflect life in other countries in a way that has special meaning to its audience. Stressing the freedom and diversity of pluralistic societies, former Soviet citizens are able to project life abroad in terms of a common fund of experience shared with their listeners.

While present or former Soviet citizens constitute the dominant element in Radio Liberty broadcasts, their broadcasts are supplemented by the participation of persons from other countries with special qualifications for addressing Soviet audiences.

A typical day's Russian-language program oriented to the special appetites of a Soviet audience might include, in addition to hourly newscasts around the clock and feature treatment of current events:

- A Soviet engineer's samizdat essay on economic reforms;
- A samizdat text of an appeal to the Soviet government on behalf of imprisoned Jewish dissenters;
- Details of changes in the Communist hierarchy of Soviet Azerbaijan;
- A foreign traveler's impressions of a visit to Central Asia;
- A British agricultural specialist's views on increasing farm output;
- A French journalist's analysis of recent political developments in Moscow;
- A discussion by scholars of problems faced by the individual in the Twentieth Century;
- A review of measures to reduce the role of the Communist Party in Yugoslavia;
- A report on social legislation in Canada;
- A reviewer's synopsis of a Polish film (not shown in the Soviet Union);
- A talk on labor productivity in the U.S.;
- A documentary of the "NEP" period of the 1920's;
- A reading from the work of the purged (and never rehabilitated) Soviet writer Boris Pilnyak;
- A dramatization (in Russian translation) of scenes from a new American play;
- A message from an American writer to his colleagues in the Soviet Union.

#### *Radio Liberty Ukrainian broadcasts*

Despite long exposure to assimilating influences, the Ukraine remains ethnically, linguistically and culturally a distinct nation. The 1970 census listed more than 40 million Ukrainians, of whom more than 35 million live on the territory of the Ukraine SSR. Those who consider the Ukrainian language to be their mother tongue comprised (in 1970) 85.7% of the Ukrainian population. Only 36.3% of Ukrainians are fluent in Russian as a second language.

The Ukraine occupies an area larger than any of the independent countries of Western or Eastern Europe. In population, the Ukraine ranks behind only four European countries: West Germany, the United Kingdom, Italy and France. Its steel production is double that of France and its grain production lags only slightly behind France's.

Ukrainian influence in the USSR is enhanced by the prominence of Ukrainians in senior party and government posts in all parts of the country, including the Central Committee in Moscow.

The 1960's began a rising clamor among Ukrainian intellectuals for more and better Ukrainian schools, books and cultural institutions, and Ukrainians have joined the chorus of political dissenters circulating their complaints through their own unofficial literature, *samvydav*. In a treatise *Internationalism or Russification?*, published abroad in 1968, Ivan Dzyuba, one of the most heavily censured members of the Ukrainian literary community, strongly criticized the nationalities policy past and present in the USSR as a whole and in the Ukraine in particular.

Radio Liberty Ukrainian broadcasts reflect Ukrainian pride in national traditions and aspirations for national integrity. At the same time—like all other Radio Liberty broadcasts—they follow a policy of non-predetermination of the future status of the USSR's constituent nationalities—that is, Radio Liberty's conviction that only Soviet citizens themselves can determine what institutions and status their national minorities shall have.

#### *Radio Liberty broadcasts in languages of Soviet Moslem people\**

The Moslem peoples of the Soviet Union are its fastest growing population element. With higher Asian birth-rates, they are outpacing the country's European nationalities. Between the 1959 and 1970 census, they increased in numbers by about 50 per cent. The largest Moslem nationality, the Uzbeks, has now overtaken the Slavic Belorussians to rank, after the Russians and Ukrainians, as the Soviet Union's third most populous nationality group: between 1959 and 1970, the number of Uzbeks rose from 6,015,000 to 9,195,000.

Radio Liberty is the only non-Communist voice to reach Soviet Moslems in their own languages. Its Moslem audience now includes more than 30 million

\*The term "Moslem" is used here to describe traditional affiliation with the Islamic community, not necessarily present-day religious practice.

people—about one Soviet citizen in eight. Of these, six nationalities (Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Azerbaijanis, Tajiks, Turkmen, Kirghiz) have their own "union republics" along the Soviet border with China and other Asian countries. Two other peoples, the Tartars and Bashkirs, have "autonomous republics." Radio Liberty also broadcasts in Uighur, the language of a Moslem people located on both sides of the Sino-Soviet border. Except for the Iranian Tajiks, these nationalities speak languages related to Turkish.

The Moslems are successfully resisting assimilation. Of those who inhabit their own union republics, more than 98% are listed in the census as having retained their own mother tongue. Soviet Moslems are part of an ancient Islamic community with a distinct way of life, much of which has been retained to the present day, despite education and modernization. Scholars specializing in the study of their contemporary literature have noted a marked tendency for them to identify more with traditional Asian and Islamic values, and with their Islamic neighbors outside the Soviet Union, than with the alien cultures of Russians and other Europeans.

Radio Liberty broadcasts feature suppressed chapters of national heritage and information on developments in the Islamic community outside the Soviet Union.

#### *Radio Liberty broadcasts in other languages*

*Belorussians.* The Belorussians, a Slavic people who inhabit a union republic on the Polish border, now rank (with a population of 9 million) as the fourth most numerous nationality of the country. Their ethnic distinctness from Great Russians have been fostered by periods of their history when they were under Polish and Lithuanian hegemony.

*Georgians.* A people of the Transcaucasus, the Georgians date their existence as an independent kingdom back to ancient times. They were converted to Christianity in the fourth century A.D.—centuries before their Slavic neighbors to the North. Now numbering more than three millions, they are noted for dedication to their land, language, and national traditions.

*Armenians.* Another people of the Transcaucasus, the Armenians also have an ancient history of independent nationhood and were converted to Christianity in early times. Victims of centuries of persecution, particularly by the neighboring Turks, the Armenians are now widely dispersed and the 3.6 million now resident in the Soviet Union are only a part of the world's total Armenian population (2.2 million in Soviet Armenia).

*Languages of the North Caucasus.* Radio Liberty is the only outside voice speaking in their own languages to mountaineers in the rugged, patchwork terrain of the North Caucasus. Some of these peoples were victims of mass national repression under Stalin.

#### *Radio Liberty broadcasts on behalf of Soviet Jews*

During recent months Radio Liberty has devoted an increasing amount of its program time to broadcasting the texts of *samizdat* documents sent by dissident Soviet citizens to the West. Among the hundreds of protest letters, petitions and declarations of human and civil rights, scores of separate appeals by individual Jews and groups of Jews protest against the regime's discriminatory practices and in many cases demand the right to emigrate to Israel. Almost all of the documents are written in Russian and are addressed either to Soviet authorities and agencies or to the outside world, e.g. U Thant, the U.N. General Assembly, the U.N. Human Rights Commission, and "Jews of the Whole World."

In broadcasting back to the USSR documents from Soviet Jews, Radio Liberty is providing a forum from which the aspirations expressed in these appeals are amplified and disseminated to millions of listeners—Jews and non-Jews alike—inside the USSR.

Long before the emergence of *samizdat* as a vehicle for Soviet Jews to reach public opinion inside Russia and abroad, Radio Liberty has consistently attempted to keep alive for its Jewish listeners an awareness of their religious, national and cultural identity, despite the regime's efforts to obliterate those traditional values. Major Jewish holidays such as Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur, Simchat Torah, Succoth, Chanukah, Passover and Shavuot have been celebrated with Hebrew prayers and songs, narrative descriptions of the significance of the holy days and messages of greetings in Yiddish from rabbis and prominent artists such as Jan Peerce.

Radio Liberty has regularly informed listeners of the condemnation of intolerance against Jews in the writings of revered Russian humanists like Tolstoy, Chekhov, Korolenko and Gorky. In addition, the station has recalled Lenin's condemnation of anti-Semitism as well as early official Soviet law prohibiting discrimination against Jews.

The criticism of Soviet anti-Semitism from Communist parties in the West and from figures respected in the USSR such as Louis Aragon and Jean-Paul Sartre has been reported to the Soviet public.

Anniversaries such as the Warsaw Ghetto uprising and the massacre at *Babi-Yar* have been commemorated. Recently, Anatoli Kuznetsov's book *Babi-Yar* was serialized on the air, with the author who is now in London reading in his own voice the passages excised by the Soviet censors.

Radio Liberty has been quick to reflect the outcry of indignation on the part of Jewish individuals and organizations in the West at the manifestations of continued Soviet anti-Semitism, e.g. execution of Jews for alleged economic crimes in Khrushchev's era, publication of *Judaism Without Embellishment*, the notorious book by Trofim Kichko. Arthur Miller's eloquent essay "On Obliterating the Jews" (*New Leader*, March 16, 1964) was translated and broadcast with the author's permission.

More recently, the trials of Leningrad Jews accused of attempted airplane hijacking and Jews in other cities accused of disseminating anti-Soviet propaganda have been fully reported by Radio Liberty, which has filled in omissions and corrected distortions in Soviet media accounts of these trials, and has kept the audience informed of the protests and demonstrations of American and Western European Jewish and non-Jewish leaders and organizations.

Since the emigration of leading Jewish dissidents such as Leonid Rigerman to the U.S. and Boris Tsukerman to Israel, Radio Liberty has acted as a bridge between them and their fellow countrymen still in the USSR by providing airtime for interviews and special programs. Mr. Rigerman is preparing a series entitled "Know Your Rights."

(For an exhibit reflecting anti-Semitic overtones of Soviet propaganda, see Annex "G.")

#### *Radio Liberty research facilities*

Through analytical reviews of the Soviet press, monitoring of Soviet radio, examination and annotation of *samizdat* material, as well as general research and analysis, Radio Liberty's research staff feeds invaluable up-to-date information and background material not only to Radio Liberty's own programmers, but also—on request—to specialists from the academic community and the mass media in the U.S. and Western Europe.

Radio Liberty's research facilities, which are open to scholars, graduate students, and journalists, cover all major topics of contemporary Soviet affairs: economics, education and youth, foreign policy, law, literature and arts, the military, religion, science and medicine, social institutions, the Soviet bloc and nationalities, and Soviet government and the Communist Party. The library collection in New York consists of 14,000 books, subscriptions to 200 Western and 220 Soviet periodicals and dailies, 2500 microfilms and extensive files of archival materials, as well as a record and tape library. In Munich researchers can draw on a library collection of 65,000 volumes, subscriptions to 291 Soviet periodicals, including 59 newspapers and 232 magazines and scholarly journals. The library also stocks documents, reports, pamphlets and microfilms. Published materials are supplemented by a large archive of in-house mimeographed research materials dating back to Radio Liberty's inception in 1951.

The complimentary distribution list for Radio Liberty publications resulting from this research records 650 names of specialists in North America who have asked to receive material regularly. Radio Liberty publications include RL Dispatches of current affairs analysis, issued several times a week; RL Research Papers, providing more extensive background material, issued on an *ad hoc* basis; RL Translations of significant articles from the Soviet press, also on an *ad hoc* basis. Radio Liberty's publications based on the current Soviet press in such languages as Uzbek, Turkmen, Kazakh and Tatar are unique in the world of sovietology.

Leading newspapers and magazines use Radio Liberty material regularly and frequently ask for background information. As requests for publications are renewed year after year, more and more scholars and journalists have attested to the value of this research.

(See Annex "L": RL Research Bulletin, 1970 Index.)

*Yardsticks of effectiveness*

Most audience "feedback" which filters out through letters and occasional face-to-face conversations between listeners and people from the West shows recognition of the unique role of RL broadcasts in forming Soviet public opinion. A Soviet journalist's comment is typical: he characterized Radio Liberty as "the only station which broadcasts detailed information on life in the Soviet Union," adding that "if you want to know the news you must listen to Liberty; all other stations . . . speak in allusions." A physician spoke of Radio Liberty as fulfilling "the function of an up-to-the-minute evening newspaper" and as having "considerably more effect on mass thinking than the official American or British radio."

Among those committed to the regime, appreciation of information gained from Radio Liberty is sometimes mixed with misgivings over what it does to their beliefs. A middle-aged Moscow Party-member, formerly an army officer, commented rather wryly: "I am afraid I have been turned into a bad Communist by my foreign radio listening." Listener letters are at times avowedly hostile, although the great majority of them incline to be favorable or at least sympathetic to the station's role.

Predictably, the regime's official reaction is far more negative. While its spokesmen usually refrain from challenging individual broadcasts, their public attacks on the station in general have increased measurably in recent years. These tend to take the form of imputing to Radio Liberty motives ("counter-revolution," "intervention," "terrorism," "provocation," "fabrication") which it lacks. Such epithets may hold little credibility for regular listeners, but they serve as an unequivocal warning against giving currency to what people hear in the broadcasts. During the first quarter of 1971, reflecting the Soviet campaign to destroy support for Radio Liberty in the U.S. and West Germany, Soviet media disseminated 77 domestic items, including a number of major articles, attacking the station.

Perhaps the most significant reaction is the regime's continued willingness to expose itself to the expense—and embarrassment—of the supreme accolade: jamming every Radio Liberty frequency during every minute it is on the air, even though such interference is only partially effective. (For details of Soviet counter-measures aimed at Radio Liberty, see Annex "M".)

At Party congresses, Central Committee plenary sessions, and other high-level meetings, as well as in journals like *Kommunist*, the competition of Western broadcasts is cited as a reason for the regime's own media to improve the accuracy and timeliness of their reporting, not only of foreign affairs but of the kind of domestic news purveyed by Radio Liberty. These admonitions have borne fruit in the very perceptible, if limited, progress made by Soviet press and radio over the years.

The key role of former Soviet citizens in the work of Radio Liberty is usually singled out for comment by both the station's admirers and detractors in the Soviet Union. There can be no doubt that the station derives much of its basic character from the native contribution to the linguistic and artistic excellence of its broadcasts, and from the unique ability of enlightened emigres to speak in terms their listeners understand. Politically and psychologically, however, the native aspect of Radio Liberty must share importance in the eyes of the audience with the fact that Western support has helped create a radio station devoted to their own concerns and interests.

*RL and Soviet-American relations*

Is the evolution of Soviet society a legitimate concern of Americans?

Under the present Party leadership, Soviet troops have intervened in the affairs of Czechoslovakia, a friendly country. In his Party Congress speech, Brezhnev called the invasion a matter of "class duty." He referred to Soviet relations with Czechoslovakia and other Soviet-bloc countries as "a prototype of the world commonwealth of free peoples" called for in Soviet plans for the future.

Recent expansion of Soviet naval strength in the Indian Ocean and the stationing of thousands of troops in Egypt show that the present leadership has ambitions that extend beyond defense of mere "spheres of influence." Above all, the commitment to foreign-policy adventures has led Soviet leaders to cling to an extensive (and expensive) program of nuclear armament (see Annex "A.6"). This confronts Americans with a dilemma: to choose between allocation of resources to

a matching system or to risk unilateral disarmament. Soviet citizens, with a much lower standard of living, feel the economic burden all the more keenly.

In contrast to the militancy of official spokesmen are the dissenting voices of influential oppositionists like Academician Sakharov:

"The division of mankind threatens it with destruction. . . .

"In the face of these perils, any action increasing the division of mankind, any preaching of the incompatibility of world ideologies and nations is madness and a crime. Only universal cooperation under conditions of intellectual freedom and the lofty moral ideals of socialism and labor, accompanied by the elimination of dogmatism and pressures of the concealed interests of the ruling classes, will preserve civilization. . . .

"Intellectual freedom of society will facilitate and smooth the way for this trend toward patience, flexibility and security from dogmatism, fear and adventurism. . . ."

(For other views of prominent Soviet dissenters, see Annex "C and D.4".)

Dissemination of the ideas of men like Academician Sakharov is clearly in the long-term interest of both Soviet and American peoples. But are the activities of a Radio Liberty in providing a channel for such dissenting voices compatible with the immediate needs of "an era of negotiation, not confrontation"?

In making international agreements, the Soviet government has always been guided by hardheaded estimates of its own interest, not questions of tone. Certainly the activities of Radio Liberty will not prevent the Soviet regime from concluding agreements that are of benefit to the USSR. If Radio Liberty were to cease broadcasts the main consequence for Soviet-American negotiations would be to discourage elements in Soviet society which exercise a moderating effect on the policy of their government.

The Soviet position on questions of "interference in internal affairs" must be viewed in the light of such actions as Soviet support for moves in the United Nations to review the status of Puerto Rico on the basis that "the people of Puerto Rico were being deprived of the opportunity of exercising their inalienable right to self-determination, and that the island continued to be a colonial territory." (See *United Nations Yearbook*, 1967, page 623.)

The broadcasts of Radio Liberty are fully in accord with Soviet conceptions of the "norms of international behavior." It is interesting to recall that, when the broadcasts of Radio Peace and Progress (housed in the same building as Radio Moscow) provoked protests from the Indian government to the Soviet government, the latter disclaimed responsibility. Radio Peace and Progress also has broadcasts to "American Negro soldiers sent to fight in Vietnam," telling them on one occasion that General Westmoreland "does his best to see that as many Negroes are killed in battle as possible." (See Annex "N.2".)

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted unanimously by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948. Article 19 of the Declaration provides:

"Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers."

On the positive side, the broadcasts of Radio Liberty raise visions of a rapprochement between the two nations, a rapprochement created not by two hostile governments for uneasy reasons of expediency but by the mutual trust and understanding of innately friendly peoples.

It has been argued that the West should refrain from any action likely to impair the stability of the world's other great nuclear arsenal. But to the extent that there is instability in the regime, it is internal; no course of foreign conduct could eliminate it, even were that a realistic goal. Faced with the inevitable evolution of Soviet society, the West should try, for its own security and survival, to encourage by every proper means those forces that are working for constructive change.

A policy of negotiation, of dialogue, must not exclude the very elements of Soviet society who are most attuned to principles in which Americans believe. This is not merely a moral imperative: it is essential to our security. If Americans and others in the West limit their overtures to those designated by the regime to receive them, our dialogue will reach not so much "the vital forces of the country" as the corridors of officialdom.

*The need for unofficial channels*

Soviet society is faced with a compelling need for political change. The intellectual dissenters of today are likely to influence the policy-makers of tomorrow. By reaching beyond the aging Soviet leaders who suppress new ideas, we make ourselves, in the minds of the Soviet public, allies for freedom and progress.

The barriers to communication erected by the regime are barriers to normalcy. No society will behave rationally if it is blind to the outside world, or if it suffers from the collective amnesia of gaps in its own history. The breakdown of barriers is an indispensable step toward more realistic behavior on the part of the Soviet Union.

Exchange programs which afford opportunities for unofficial communication are a healthy step in this direction. But they are subject to official manipulation, and those involved are relatively few in number compared with broadcasting audiences. Generally, exchange programs and short-wave radio are complementary in effect, each helping in its own way to overcome barriers.

The effectiveness of radio communication stems from its ability to cross borders, with only the partial impediment of jamming to prevent its message from reaching listeners. But how should an open society organize broadcasting to reach private individuals in other countries?

Should international communication be conducted by government exclusively, by private business, or by some other institutional arrangement?

Clearly, broadcasts to the Soviet Union could not be self-supporting on a commercial basis, even were it in the public interest for them to be so. On the other hand, governmental broadcasting is limited in range: it is awkward for the voice of one government to speak to those in opposition to another government with which it maintains official relations. This is a particular problem for broadcasts to the Soviet Union, whose rulers consider all opposition to be disloyal and illegitimate, and all information and opinion not sanctioned by current policy to be subversive.

In international communications, attempts to find a middle way are not new. Radio Free Europe was organized 22 years ago to broadcast to Eastern Europe, and Radio Liberty 19 years ago to broadcast to the peoples of the Soviet Union. It was recognized that independently-operated, non-commercial radios serving the public interest could deal more freely with a broad range of internal and international affairs than an official spokesman of the government. It was also seen that representatives of the democratic emigration from these communist countries constitute a uniquely effective means of communicating with people there.

This form of broadcasting does not constitute intervention in Soviet internal affairs. A Radio Liberty seeks to impose no specific political system, ideology or creed on its audiences. Change in Soviet society can be effected only from within. The West can offer, at most, the all-important catalyst; truthful information for those who tune in on their own free will.

It should be noted that a broadcaster like Radio Liberty has no built-in commitment to continue tension; it thrives on improved relations as they increase opportunities for dialogue. This reduces to a simple idea: "There can never be too much understanding between the peoples of the world's two most powerful nations."

*A unique world asset*

Radio Liberty's international reputation makes of it an asset not only to the United States but to America's friends throughout the world.

The prestige which RL has gained among U.S. allies is reflected in the statements by British and French scholars reproduced in the Appendix. A comment by Switzerland's most influential newspaper is given in Annex "I.2."

For a brief sampling of comments on the meaning of RL by persons formerly prominent in Soviet society see the Appendix.

The audience and recognition acquired in nearly two decades of continuous broadcasting, the experience and ability (including rare linguistic skills and cultural backgrounds) of staff specialists, the specialized facilities which required years to design and construct, and the operating licenses and frequencies used by Radio Liberty, all combine to make of the station a unique asset to the world. It would require many years to reassemble all of the ingredients of a Radio Liberty, and even then it might be impossible to duplicate the station in its present form.

APPENDIX

SOME STATEMENTS ON RADIO LIBERTY

1. From Leonard Schapiro, University of London
2. From Peter Reddaway, University of London
3. From Professor Hugh Seton-Watson to the London *Daily Telegraph*
4. From Max Hayward, Oxford University
5. From Dr. Nikolay Andreyev, Cambridge University
6. From Martin Dewhurst, Glasgow University to the *Guardian*, London
7. From Asher Lee, former Director of BBC External Research
8. From professors of the University of Paris  
Nikita Struve  
Jean Train  
Cyrille Eltchaninoff
9. From William Cole, former CBS Moscow correspondent
10. From O. A. Kerusky, son of the late Alexander Kerensky
11. From Aziz Ulug-Zade, former lecturer at Moscow University (until 1967)
12. From Georgi Yevgenevich Trifonov (pen name "Mikhail Dyomin"), member of Union of Soviet Writers (until 1968)
13. From Anatoly Kuznetsov, member of Union of Soviet Writers (until 1969), to the London *Daily Telegraph*
14. From Oleg Lenchevsky, Soviet scientist (until 1962)
15. From Natalia Belinkov
16. From Nikolai Rychkov, Soviet actor (until 1965)
17. From Boris Tsukerman, Soviet physicist and human-rights leader (until 1971)

(Transmitted by Telex from London)

1. From Leonard Schapiro, London University

Leonard Schapiro, LLB, Barrister at Law, honorary foreign member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Professor of Political Science (with special reference to Russian Studies) at the University of London (London School of Economics and Political Science), Author of the Origin of the Communist Autocracy (1955), The Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Second Edition 1971), The Government and Politics of the Soviet Union (Third Edition 1971), etc.

JUNE 2, 1971.

To The Honorary Chairman,  
Radio Liberty Committee.

DEAR MR. TRUMAN: I understand that the status and future of Radio Liberty are at present under discussion in Congress. I trust that the views and experience of one whose academic duties have for many years been related to close study of Soviet policies may be of some interest.

I have followed the work of Radio Liberty very closely for over fifteen years. The products of the research in which it engages, and on which it broadcasts are founded, have been closely studied by me and by my colleagues in my department for many years. I have no hesitation in stating that the quality of this research has been consistently high and that it has proved of inestimable value to those who, like ourselves, are concerned with the study of the Soviet Union.

As I say, the broadcast programmes are based on this deep research which, so far as I can assess, is unique, at any rate outside government departments, in scope, content and depth. I have been acquainted with, at any rate, a fair sample of these programmes for many years. They are scrupulously accurate, so far as human endeavor makes this possible. They provide the Soviet listener with information of which he would otherwise remain ignorant, both in the world outside and, more particularly, within the USSR itself. Some of the broadcasts have gone further than this and have provided the listener with information of an educational nature which is systematically denied to Soviet citizens at home: in this category fall important books, not available inside the Soviet Union, broadcast in serial installments.

There is no doubt whatever in my mind, or in the mind of many of my colleagues in the Soviet field, that Radio Liberty broadcasts in past years have made an outstanding contribution to the opening up of the closed minds of Soviet citizens. This can be inferred from official Soviet reactions and from conversations with Soviet or former Soviet citizens, of which I have had personal experience. The present dissent movement, which is the most hopeful

feature of the present-day Soviet scene, is directly sustained and encouraged by the fact that so much of the material which the dissidents produce inside the USSR and, at risk to themselves, post abroad, is broadcast to the Soviet Union by Radio Liberty. There would be little hope otherwise for those who are, by all civilized standards, entitled to voice their loyal criticism—to be heard or read widely by their fellow-citizens.

The hope for the future of the world, for peace and for fellowship in place of strife and enmity, lies in the evolution of Soviet Russia towards a more democratic and more tolerant way of life. It is out of oppression and intolerant regimes alone that aggression emerges. No one more than you, Mr. Truman, knows the importance of the free exchange of information and opinion in building a free world, fit for our children to live in. It is at times like these that the battle for the minds of men has become so vitally important. Any reduction in the effectiveness of Radio Liberty at this moment of time would be very short-sighted policy. I very much hope, sir, that you will be successful in your endeavours in resisting any measure which would have this deplorable effect and it is in the hope that my opinion (which is disinterested in the sense that I am a very infrequent contributor to RL programmes) may possibly be of some slight support to you that I have written this letter.

Yours sincerely,

(Transmitted by Telex from London)

2. *From Peter Reddaway, The London School of Economics and Political Science, University of London, Houghton Street, Aldwych, London W.C.2*

June 2, 1971.

To Mr. Howland Sargeant,  
Radio Liberty Committee.

DEAR MR. SARGEANT: As someone who writes extensively on Soviet Affairs in the Press and academic publications, I have been very disturbed recently by various reports concerning the future of Radio Liberty. It is my firm conviction, based on much up-to-date evidence, that any reduction in the level of efficiency of Radio Liberty's invaluable work, either now or in the foreseeable future, could only harm the interests of the USA and the western world as a whole.

From my intensive study in recent years of the democratic tendencies and movements in the USSR, I have found massive evidence of the importance which these tendencies and movements attach to Radio Liberty. Much of this evidence must already be known to you, but I will happily send you some of what I have collected if you wish.

In broad terms it must be in the West's interests and those of future world peace to encourage the democratic tendencies I have mentioned. For a long time I have marvelled at the large amount of definite good done by Radio Liberty at relatively low cost, when compared with the doubtful or marginal good achieved by certain much more expensive weapon systems. In narrower terms, any limitation of Radio Liberty's activity would undoubtedly be viewed by the democratic movement in the USSR as something near to an American betrayal of itself and of America's own values.

The reason for this is that Radio Liberty's terms of reference are very different from those of, say, VOA or the BBC, with the result that these stations could in no way replace Radio Liberty. Much more than other stations, Radio Liberty has a duty to focus on the life and problems of the USSR and to provide a platform for the views of Soviet citizens which cannot get a hearing in the USSR because of the draconian Soviet censorship of all the means of mass communication. At a time when these views are reaching the West in typescript form in a massive and ever-increasing quantity, and the need for Radio Liberty is therefore greater than ever, it is ironical to the point of tragedy that various people should now try to undermine its work. Naturally it is, and will continue to be, an irritant to the Soviet regime, as is all uncensored, responsible broadcasting. But there is no reason whatever to believe that the Regime is likely to move in the direction of ideological coexistence in the foreseeable future, and so Moscow Radio and the various unofficial Soviet stations will certainly continue to beam to the West a stream of subversive, anti-western broadcasts, whatever may be done or not done about Radio Liberty. No quid pro quo has apparently been offered by the Soviets, and even if it were, they would not honour

164

any general agreement about, e.g. toning down Moscow Radio. Finally, the level of accuracy and responsibility of Radio Liberty far surpasses, of course, that of Moscow Radio.

Hoping and trusting that you and your colleagues will successfully weather the current difficulties.

Yours sincerely,

(Transmitted by Telex from London)

3. *From Professor Hugh Seton-Watson to the "Daily Telegraph" London*

SIR: I understand that a Commission of the United States Senate is shortly to consider the work of the two American-supported Radio Stations which are based in Munich and which broadcast to the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe—Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. There have even been suggestions that these stations should be closed down. It is presumably not a coincidence that the press of the Communist world has recently mounted a strong campaign of attack on the work of these two stations and that the Polish Government has approached the West German Government with a demand that it should no longer permit Radio Free Europe to operate from its territory.

It is not surprising that the Communist rulers should resent the freedom of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe to broadcast their programs uncensored direct to the peoples of the Communist world. Their pained reaction is a sure sign of the effectiveness of the broadcasts. It is, however, alarming that responsible people in the West should find it possible to contemplate restricting the work which these two stations have done with such skill and responsibility for so long.

Because of the absolute control which Communist Governments have over the supply of information for the great majority of their people, broadcasting is the only means the West has of conducting a dialogue and letting them know something of what is happening and being said beyond the frontiers of the Communist world. Despite the elaborate and expensive measures which Communist Governments take to prevent the broadcasts being heard, there is much evidence that the present audiences can be counted in millions.

Opponents of broadcasting to the Communist world often depict it as a reversion to the cold war likely to damage our relations with the Soviets and their subjects. This is a complete misconception.

I know from long personal experience that both the Europeans and the Americans responsible for running Radio Free Europe are extremely well informed, balanced in their judgment and in no sense fanatical crusaders or dogmatists. They are people who have been working for years to bring about true understanding between the different nations of Europe, not to perpetuate cliches and ritual incantations.

A part from anything else, the work of research and analysis conducted by Radio Free Europe and the publications which emerge from it are of an extremely high standard and essential reading for all serious students of Eastern Europe.

It is not the organizers of these two Radio Stations who are fanatics and dogmatists, but the present Masters of the Soviet Union, who are not content to have a predominant political and military position in Eastern Europe, but insist also on oppressing and humiliating peoples of ancient European culture, forcing them to deny their own traditions and falsify and refalsify their own history. The proceedings of the recent Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party serves as an appalling reminder of this.

This is the system which, if they were given the chance, the Communist Leaders would like to spread into the rest of Europe. The cold war is not a Western policy perversely devised by fanatics but a description of a state of affairs brought about by the implacable and unending hostility of the Rulers in Moscow. The work performed by Radio Free Europe is of the greatest value not only for the dialogue which it maintains with the peoples of Eastern Europe, but also for telling the truth to people in the West and preventing them from relaxing into a stupor of false security.

Yours,

(Transmitted by Telex from London)

4. *From Max Hayward, Fellow of St. Anthony's College (Oxford), translator and author of works on Russian literature*

OXFORD, June 2, 1971.

I understand from press reports that the future of Radio Liberty is at the moment in the balance. If the Radio is denied funds to continue its work, it will be a threefold tragedy: a vital source of news and enlightened comment about the outside world will be withdrawn from listeners in the Soviet Union just at the very time when it is most needed; the invaluable by-products of Radio Liberty's activities, notably its research bulletins and systematic compilations of material from the Soviet Union, will no longer be available to the many outside users in the academic world; and the ever-increasing number of refugees and defectors from the Soviet Union will be deprived of the material and moral support which RL gives them, and which they can expect from no other organization in the West.

There are many other excellent reasons for not dismantling an enterprise into which so much effort and idealism has gone, but these are the ones I personally would stress and I can only hope they appear as cogent to those who decide the fate of the Radio as they do to me.

Yours sincerely,

(Transmitted by Telex from London)

5. *Statement by Dr. Nikolay Andreyev, fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge, lecturer in Slavonic studies at the University of Cambridge, M.A. Ph. D. (Also former Director of the Kondakov Institute in Prague)*

JUNE 2, 1971.

The Soviet listener, whom I meet fairly frequently and who on occasions has made a point of seeking me out and asking me to put requests to Radio Liberty, makes a sharp differentiation between the official government line which he gets from the BBC and VOA and the line of Radio Liberty which he sees as an independent organization which can speak for the Soviet citizen and can take a far fuller interest in his problems.

Radio Liberty's programs can be heard especially well high up in Muscovite skyscrapers, and the programs are listened to with great interest, since foreign radio broadcasts are the one thing that Soviet censorship is powerless to deal with. Soviet listeners to Radio Liberty feel that the views expressed by recent political refugees are taken into account and, therefore, that the programs are very factual in content and constructive in outlook. The official government programs act as disseminators of general information, whereas Radio Liberty, dealing as it does with the internal problems of Soviet society, is the voice of Soviet listeners saying that which they are not at liberty to say in their own country.

(Transmitted by Telex from London)

6. *From Martin Deutsch, Glasgow University (Excerpts from his letter to the Guardian, London)*

"... How lucky we are in the West to be able to compare Soviet official, Soviet unofficial (*samizdat*) and Western views about developments in the modern world!

We might occasionally recall how unfortunate in this respect are practically the entire population of several East European countries and the Soviet Union. The importance of the censorship systems in these countries can, I think, hardly be exaggerated, and the leaders of these countries know it. In Soviet Russia, for instance, Lenin began to organize the censorship of the press about a week after seizing power and over a month before such an important institution as the secret police (*Cheka*) was established.

"Because of the inherent limitations of *samizdat* and the restrictions on the sale of Western books, journals and newspapers, the only way to break the virtual monopoly on information in the U.S.S.R. and some of the East European countries is to broadcast to them from outside. It is therefore not in the least surprising that attempts are being made by certain people in Warsaw and

Moscow to close down stations like Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, whose programmes are now so informative, reliable and responsible . . . The work of these radio-stations should be stepped up, not stopped or curtailed."

---

(Transmitted by Telex from London)

*7. Statement from Asher Lee, former Director of BBC External Research*

"I, Asher Lee, Wing Commander of the RAF and author of books on the Soviet Air Force--Air Power--The German Air Force (a subject on which I briefed Sir Winston Churchill, Presidents Roosevelt and Truman as well as Stalin), etc. would like to make the following statement concerning the work of Radio Liberty. It is based on my experience as BBC Director of External Audience Research, a post I held from 1948 to 1970.

"During my years with BBC Audience Research, I have had numerous opportunities to observe the work of Radio Liberty at first hand and to note its impact on the Soviet audience. Due to its unique position as a non-governmental station and staffed to a large extent by former Soviet citizens, Radio Liberty is able to provide programs, specializing with unique sensitivity on Soviet affairs, which lie outside the province of stations such as BBC which are linked to their governments. In this sense, Radio Liberty's broadcasts have complemented those of the BBC and have not duplicated them. In the research work conducted by us at BBC, we received many indications that this unique service provided by Radio Liberty was widely heard and appreciated by a significant audience in the USSR who, to a great extent, rely on Radio Liberty for information and analysis on events in their land and abroad. Indeed, many Soviet listeners have referred to Radio Liberty as their own station. Its broadcasters are not regarded as foreigners transmitting from abroad, but as friends who enlighten. I would like to add that the contribution Radio Liberty is making to building an informed public in the Soviet Union is in the long range interests of a real detente in Europe and an understanding between the Great Powers."

---

(Transmitted by Telex from Paris)

*8. Statements by Leading French Professors of the University of Paris*

A. *Statement by Nikita Struve, Professor of Russian Literature at Nanterre.* "That Radio Liberty is listened to by many, many people in the Soviet Union, and especially the intellectuals, is proved by the reactions that I myself have always had from any interview which I have given to this station. These reactions are not only numerous, but also perceptive and well reasoned."

B. *Statement by Jean Train, Professor of Russian at the Ecole Polytechnique.* "Radio Liberty, according to many of my informants, is listened to avidly by most of the intellectuals and leaders in the Soviet Union with whom I have been in contact for many years. So important are these programs that I know of a number of groups which have been formed for the express purpose of listening to them and discussing them afterwards. Most important for the Soviets is the news that Radio Liberty broadcasts about their own country, all sorts of information that the Soviet Radio either never gives or perhaps, when forced by circumstances, gives only much later."

C. *Statement by Cyrille Elitchaninoff, Professor of Russian Philosophy at the Institute of Eastern Languages.* "In conversation with Soviet citizens, especially with those belonging to the intellectual class, I have had many occasions to hear high praise of the programs of Radio Liberty. The Soviets particularly appreciate the objectivity of Radio Liberty, its first class information on what is happening in the USSR or events which are often not known through Soviet media. Many Soviets have said that they only wish they could have more news and programs of this quality."

167

(Transmitted by Telex from Paris)

9. *Comments on Radio Liberty by William Cole, former CBS Correspondent in Russia, Double Award Winner for 1970 Film "Voices From the Russian Underground"*

"Truth in Russia was once described as 'What is good for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.' For the real facts, both about the world outside and their own secretive system, countless Russians rely on Radio Liberty."

(Transmitted by Telex from London)

10. *From O. A. Kerensky, son of the late Alexander Kerensky*

JUNE 4, 1971.

Dear Mr. Ryser: Please forgive me bothering you, but I feel I must write in connection with various perturbing statements in the press about the role of Radio Liberty and its future. I shall be grateful if you would forward the following message to those who are responsible for the running of Radio Liberty.

Although I cannot claim to have a detailed knowledge of Radio Liberty's work, I know about it from friends who work there and by having occasionally listened to its broadcasts, I wish to say that I deem it to be a very necessary organization because it provides the citizens of the Soviet Union with information and comment which they cannot obtain from any other source. As a non-official organization, Radio Liberty is able to say certain things which neither the BBC nor the Voice of America is able to speak about in the same way. I think it would be tragic if the work of RL were interfered with in any way—on the contrary, it should be given every opportunity to continue now what it has succeeded in building up, after many years, a sizeable audience in Russia and elsewhere.

Yours sincerely,

O. A. KERENSKY.

(Transmitted by Telex from London)

11. *Statement by Aziz Ulug-Zade, Lecturer at Moscow University until his defection in 1967, now Deputy-Head of the Russian Section of the BBC.*

JUNE 2, 1971.

"If one considers that the Soviet Union works 24 hours a day with the aim of spreading deliberate disinformation and of preserving a distorted picture of the world in the minds of the Soviet population, the need for a Western Station working specifically and exclusively for the Soviet Union would seem to me obvious. Radio Liberty has the unique role and possibility of working only for Soviet listeners, both covering events and also explaining the significance of them. National stations such as the BBC and VOA cannot afford to dig into the past of the Soviet Union and to deal in detail with Soviet domestic affairs, so it is up to Liberty to do this. In my opinion, it is the least that the West can do to finance such a station.

"Now that we have the 'Chronicles' and the various protests of Soviet dissidents, there is a need to broadcast this material back to the Soviet Union to inform the whole of the population what is happening in their country. The national stations can cover the world events and the main facts, but this is often not enough for Soviet listeners. Radio Liberty should work on different lines. It is Radio Liberty's role to counter Soviet ideology. They have the time and the facilities to do this more solidly and more seriously than the national stations, and for a Soviet listeners there are a great many things which have to be explained. The national stations sometimes fail to give Soviet citizens what they need because, unlike Radio Liberty, they do not specialize in this field. I do not for a moment doubt the effectiveness of Radio Liberty."

(Transmitted by Telex from Paris)

12. *From Georgi Yevgenevich Trifonov, former Soviet Writer*

"My name is *Georgi Yevgenevich Trifonov*. I write under the pen name of Mikhail Dyomin. As a Russian poet and author I was a member of the Soviet Writers Union from 1959 to 1968 when I chose freedom and remained in France.

"I have been well acquainted with the broadcasts of Radio Liberty for many years. In my opinion a station like Radio Liberty is indispensable since it is the only broadcaster that gives special attention to events in the Soviet Union. In addition to its News Service, it provides a wide variety of unique programs of special concern to the Soviet Intelligentsia. An example is its broadcasts on literature, which are of the greatest importance for intelligent, independent thinking people in Russia, those that comprise that segment of the intelligentsia from whom all impulses for positive change are emanating."

---

13. *Excerpt from letter to London "Daily Telegraph" by Anatoly Kuznetsov, author of "Babi Yar," the prize-winning book about German and Soviet atrocities in the Ukraine during World War II*

"I could say a great deal about how essential a part of life and how great a source of hope for Soviet citizens is Radio Liberty, whose broadcasts I listened to regularly until I left the Soviet Union in the middle of 1969.

"But my views on this subject may very well be considered biased. Let me therefore quote from a Soviet newspaper, *Komsomolskaya Pravda* for May 29, 1971. Discussing the conclusions which Soviet propagandists should draw from the work of Radio Liberty, the paper said:

The reports which we publish must deal more frankly with the unfavourable features and developments in our society. It is always better for us to analyse them ourselves than to wait for commentaries by various 'voices' i.e. foreign radio stations which reach our public in one way or the other, directly or by roundabout means. Our reports on events in the West should be less superficial. Talk of the 'bared teeth of savage imperialism' fail to impress many people in these days. We must go more deeply into things for our young people.

"This unexpected comment by a Soviet newspaper contains everything—an admission that Radio Liberty provides true factual information, confirmation that it reaches a wide circle of listeners and, moreover, the statement that the Soviet Press compares very unfavourably with Radio Liberty.

"The above quotation makes it quite clear that Soviet propaganda does not provide information of an 'unfavourable' nature and that it limits its account of life in the West to talk of the 'bared teeth of imperialism.'

"On top of all that we cannot avoid the conclusion from what the Soviet newspaper says that, if it were not for the broadcasts by Radio Liberty (the station most violently attacked in the article). Soviet propaganda would continue unhindered in its work of deceiving the population with rosy pictures of life in the Soviet police-state and denunciations of 'imperialism' in the West.

"Were it not for Radio Liberty it would never have occurred to them to revise, however little, their Stalinist ideas."

---

(Transmitted by Telex from London)

14. *From Oleg Lenchevsky, former Soviet scientist and Communist Party member, who defected in 1962 and is now employed in the Russian section of the BBC*

JUNE 2, 1971.

All these alarming rumors and hints in the press about the future of Radio Liberty have prompted me to write to you. They are all the more alarming to me because you know how highly I always regarded Radio Liberty's activities, missionary work in which I had both the honour and pleasure of participating in the mid-1960's, in my then capacity of a recent Soviet scientist and party member. Actually, it was my collaboration with your station which prepared the ground for my subsequent joining the Russian section of the BBC where

I finally found the second professional vocation of my life. I think it would not be an exaggeration to say that it was Radio Liberty which endowed me with real taste for genuine, first class broadcasting to the Russians. Not unnaturally, I shall always try to do my best to convey to them the word of truth and encouragement from the free West.

In point of fact, those in charge of the Soviet propaganda machine have never made any secret of the fact that this is one of the most powerful weapons of the Western world. What a shame it is that the necessity has now arisen of pointing this obvious truth out to some responsible people here. How on earth, I wonder, can these people be persuaded of the enormous misapprehension under which they are labouring? Perhaps by making them on-the-spot observers, letting them live in the very midst of my hapless former fellow-countrymen, totally deprived of any sort of truthful information, vegetating on a rickety diet of chronic lies from Radio Moscow and Pravda.

It should also be stressed that Radio Liberty has a quite exceptional uniqueness owing to its being a non-governmental organization of exclusive outspokenness and integrity. This, along with its superb performance both in general and linguistic terms, explains why Soviet listeners tend to rate Radio Liberty above VOA and the BBC. For this reason, one can justifiably claim that any curtailment of Radio Liberty's activities would be at least as damaging to the interests of the free world and America itself as, say, a drastic curtailment of the USA's military commitments in Europe.

Needless to say, I would be only too happy if you would pass on to those concerned these spontaneous thoughts of mine, which would seem to me self-apparent.

Yours,

---

15. *Excerpts from a letter from Natalia Belinkov, former staff-member of the Sociological Department of the Moscow Radio and Television Committee, now a lecturer at Yale University, who left the Soviet Union in 1968 together with her husband, the late Arkady Belinkov, a well-known literary critic.*

"... For a society to have a normal spiritual development it must be informed of what goes on in the world. It must have objective, uncensored information about international events and the unremitting struggle of the peoples of the whole world for extension of their democratic rights. It must have information about trends in world science and about new experiments in arts. As you well know, the Soviet press is non-objective, while the Western press has its access to the USSR limited. Man in modern society differs from the caveman in that he cannot be satisfied with oral information gleaned from infrequent encounters with representatives of another tribe (in this case, foreigners) or with tales told by returning travellers. Even this opportunity, by the way, is a rare one for Soviet people.

"The functions of missing information media are fulfilled by Western radio stations. This is done most successfully by Radio Liberty, and its function must be preserved.

"The world is not isolated. In our age distances have shortened; both in time and space. If the moon is now closer to the earth, then the proximity of America and the USSR has also become much greater. The development of oppositional ideas in Russia and the development of democratic movements in the West must find common ground...

"I well remember the efforts made by my friends to hear, despite difficulty, the unfettered word filtering through jamming. My invalid husband would spend hours sitting tensely before the radio, operating the volume and tuning controls with both hands. We saved our money, and even went without necessities, in order to buy the most sensitive receiver; all of us had homemade schedules of broadcasts by the BBC, VOA and Liberty. People bought (illegally, of course) special adapters for Soviet-made receivers in order to increase the range of frequencies. We would report to each other immediately on what we had heard, and set up a timetable to take turns listening. I happen to know that recently this timetable has been operating throughout the nighttime when the jammers are ineffective. The technique of listening has been perfected. Broadcasts are being recorded on tape recorders. The broadcasts that are most prized by listeners get transcribed on the typewriter and become part of *samizdat*...

"The ending or altering in character of Radio Liberty broadcasts would be a major catastrophe for the Soviet opposition."

(Transmitted by Telex from London)

16. *Statement (excerpt) by Nikolai Rychkov (former actor of the Lenin Komsomol Theater in Moscow), who spent 18 years in Soviet camps during Stalin's time. He requested political asylum in 1965 and began working in the Russian section of the BBC a year later. (Excerpt translated from Russian.)*

"Of all overseas radiostations broadcasting in Russian, the most Russian one, of course, is Radio Liberty. It is also the most talented one. The measure of talent is taste—an extremely imprecise instrument. But the *ability* of the staff can be measured. And here one can prove precisely that at "Liberty" there are the most cultured literary figures, radio journalists and commentators, announcers and actors. All of them are Russian . . . The station has an irreplaceable voice . . ."

---

(Transmitted from Jerusalem)

17. *From Boris Tsukerman, Soviet Physicist and human-rights activist who left the Soviet Union in January 1971 (Translation)*

I, Boris Tsukerman, a citizen of Israel resident in Jerusalem, have the following to declare:

Until January 1971 I was a permanent resident of Moscow. Occasionally I was able to hear individual broadcasts of Radio Liberty or parts of broadcasts. Occasionally I learned about various broadcasts from acquaintances who had heard them. When at times I stayed outside the city my impressions of Liberty's Russian broadcasts came about more systematically. On the basis of my own observations and talks with other persons I can frame the following conclusions:

1. Radio Liberty has its own audience in the USSR. This conclusion is the result of my conversations with many people. It also stems from the following line of reasoning . . . Liberty's radio broadcasts are regularly jammed by a widespread network of powerful jamming stations, whose construction and operation requires large appropriations. Taking into consideration the austerity program constantly being urged by the Party and government, it is impossible to believe that these appropriations are approved only in order to demonstrate the attitude of Soviet people to the quality of the broadcasts. One must conclude that there are many people who wish to listen to Liberty broadcasts and who have to be confronted with an obstacle in so doing.

2. In the USSR there is a genuine need for information which cannot be gleaned from the official press and radio. The government knows of this need and tried to some extent to fill it through the so-called "White TASS," which reprints the more topical reports from the foreign press. However, this publication is accessible only to a small fraction of top officials. The rest have to seek other possibilities. Thus, for me it was a matter of topical interest to know whether many Jews like myself were obtaining permits to leave for Israel. Or what were the latest feats of the Palestine partisans. These have been completely ignored for some time by the Soviet press. And much else.

Of course, "White TASS" answered all of these questions, but it was almost inaccessible, and I attempted to pick up broadcasts of foreign radio stations. Special hopes were placed, of course, on a radio station which paid special heed to the requirements of various categories of Soviet radio listeners and had the mission of satisfying these requirements.

3. I also know that Radio Liberty broadcasts are occasionally subjected in Russia to serious criticism by the listeners. The criticism is usually constructive in character and dictated by a desire to raise the level of broadcasts of the only Russian radio station abroad. It may be that the radio station is at the stage where, in order to make it respond to its purpose, it should be subjected to some serious reorganization. However, this problem requires serious study and analysis which, of course, is not to place in question the existence of a Russian radio station as such.

---

ANNEXES

The documents named here were submitted in total to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 14, 1971.

*A. Soviet Distortions in Domestic Propaganda*

- A. 1 Soviet distortion of Justice Douglas' book *Points of Rebellion*, as reported in the *New York Times*, March 15, 1971.
- A. 2 On the day of the Czech invasion: Selection from *Message from Moscow*, including translation of *Pravda* front page for August 21, 1968.
- A. 3 On Soviet cultural influence in Egypt: Translation of *Pravda* article "Symbol of Life."
- A. 4 Translation of *Izvestia* article on the Leningrad Trials, January, 1971.
- A. 5 Excerpts from Brezhnev's speech to the CPSU Congress, March, 1971.
- A. 6 On the Soviet Military: Article from the *New York Times*, June 2, 1971.

*B. An American Journalist on Soviet Public Opinion: Excerpts from Anatole Shub's An Empire Loses Hope.*

*C. On Dissent in the Soviet Union: Full text with accompanying documents of Bohdan R. Bociurkiw's article "Political Dissent in the Soviet Union." Studies in Comparative Communism, April, 1970.*

*D. On the Phenomenon of Samizdat*

- D. 1 "The Future of Samizdat: Significance and Prospects": Transcript of the London Conference on Samizdat, April 23, 1971.
- D. 2 Report: Radio Liberty's Russian Service Samizdat Programming.
- D. 3 "Five Years of Samizdat: A Bibliography," a Radio Liberty Handbook.
- D. 4 Quotations from Samizdat.

*E. Radio Liberty Russian Programming*

- E. 1 RL Russian Program Schedule

*F. Translation of a Radio Liberty Ukrainian Broadcast: "Introduction to Ivan Dziuba's 'Internationalism or Russification?'"*

*G. Soviet Anti-Semitic Cartoons*

*H. Radio Liberty Broadcasts to Other Nationalities: A Breakdown of RL Programming in Each of Its Languages, April 30, 1971.*

*I. Evaluation of Radio Liberty*

- I. 1 Letters from RL listeners: "What Is Liberty?" A Listeners' Symposium.
- I. 2 A Western European evaluation: "Vexing Freedom of Information?" *Neue Zuercher Zeitung*, August 30, 1970, p. 4.

*J. Radio Liberty's Shortwave Audience*

- J. 1 Maps showing transmitter coverage contours.

*K. Radio Liberty's Technical Facilities*

- K. 1 Combined Broadcast Schedule, May 2, 1971.

*L. Radio Liberty Research Bulletin, 1970 Index*

*M. Soviet Countermeasures*

- M. 1 Soviet Jamming
- M. 2 Soviet Regime Media Attacks Against Radio Liberty
- M. 3 Example of a Soviet attack: "Troubles of the 'Committee of 40,'" *Izvestia*, March 18, 1971.

*N. Soviet Media*

- N. 1 Radio Peace and Progress advertisement from the *World Radio and Television Handbook*, 1971.
- N. 2 Radio Peace and Progress interference in the affairs of other countries.
- N. 3 Program Schedule for Moscow I (Radio), March 17, 1971.
- N. 4 Radio Moscow and other Soviet short wave foreign language stations, as listed in the *World Radio and Television Handbook*, 1971.

YALE UNIVERSITY,  
New Haven, Conn., June 3, 1971.

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have followed with increasing puzzlement and dismay reports in the press of criticisms of the purposes and effects of Radio Liberty activities. I believe that Radio Liberty has performed a very useful function. To abolish it

or to discredit it or even to impair its functioning would be a disaster, it seems to me.

As a scholar I have long admired and I have found most useful the research and publication activities of Radio Liberty. These information activities are very important to scholars, journalists, and other communicators not only in the United States but in Europe, Asia, South Africa, and other parts of the world. While I do not know as much about Radio Liberty's broadcasts as I do about its research and publication, I am confident that the broadcasts are truthful and objective and that they are serving a very useful purpose. I am aware of the nature of Soviet official criticism of Radio Liberty and from its tone, as well as from what I know of letters by Soviet listeners and statements made by Soviet citizens in contacts with foreigners I derive confidence that a good job of truthful and effective communication is being done.

Access to information is the basis of rational conduct. It is no accident that free and open societies are those in which there are political oppositions and a free press. Now it might be argued that a democracy such as the United States should not engage in any organized activity such as that conducted by Radio Liberty, since all information activity should be purely private. This might be a sound argument if it were not for the existence of such regimes as that in power in the Soviet Union, which confer a monopoly of control over information to a small group of persons authorized by the supreme political authorities. If truthful information about the life and purposes of the American people is to reach the peoples of the Soviet Union it can only be through such an agency as Radio Liberty.

In recent years the desire among Soviet citizens for freedom of information and freedom of expression has grown enormously. This is all to the good. The champions of freedom of information in the USSR, such as the great novelist Solzhenitsyn or the eminent scientist Sakharov are in considerable measure dependent on non-Soviet sources of information for the data upon which they base their analyses of both Soviet and world developments. This is not to say that such men would necessarily share or agree with American official or unofficial opinions about particular problems or policies. What does seem clear, however, is that those people in the Soviet Union who are striving for constructive political change need the information supplied by such programs as those broadcast by Radio Liberty.

It is possible that some of the current criticism of Radio Liberty may be based upon the belief that the Soviet leaders have given up their traditional practice of distorting or suppressing information about life in the United States and about the values and purposes of the American people. Those who follow the Soviet press and the speeches of Soviet leaders, such as Brezhnev's contentious report to the recent Twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union know that distortion and manipulation still remain the basic style of political communication in the USSR. It is true that scholars and experts are now given access to much more information about foreign affairs than was formerly the case. However, they are required to interpret this information in accordance with Kremlin directives. In such a situation, the moderating influence of differences of opinion and free discussion are not felt. Radio Liberty by supplying truthful information helps combat the suppression and distortion systematically practiced by the Kremlin and thus tends to restrain Kremlin hawks and support the hopes of Soviet scientists, writers, and others who strive for constructive political change in the USSR. To abandon such an effort now when it is more needed than ever before, and has increasing possibilities for producing beneficial results would be folly.

I would like to request that this letter be included in the record of hearings before your Committee on the proposals regarding Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty by Senator Case on May 24.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK C. BARGHOORN,  
*Professor of Political Science.*

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI,  
Coral Gables, Fla., May 21, 1971.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,  
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,*  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am pleased to have this opportunity to express to the Committee my views on the broadcasting services to the Soviet Union main-

tained by Radio Liberty, as well as on the services to Eastern Europe maintained by Radio Free Europe.

I dealt with this area for many years in official positions in the Department of State, including the Directorship of the Voice of America from 1949 to 1952, and for four years as American Ambassador in Moscow. The subject of Western radio broadcasts—including those of RL and RFE—to this area engaged my attention periodically in various official capacities. Since 1968, the area and the subject itself have continued to interest me as a consultant to the Department and as a member of the academic community. For these reasons, I am familiar with the matter now before the Committee. While my remarks pertain particularly to RL, as I am best acquainted with that radio and its target area, I believe they are also applicable to RFE.

Let me say at the outset that I strongly support Western radio broadcasts into the Soviet bloc, and consider the services of RL and RFE to be especially important. I hope this Committee, and the Congress, will find means to see that RL and RFE continue to operate without alteration of their unique characters. This I believe will be in the US public interest and in the interest of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. I also believe that continuation of these two broadcasting services is fully compatible with the long-range stability of our relations with that area, since I believe that true stability can only be assured by evolutionary progress in the target countries.

The fundamental reason for such broadcasting is the practice in the Soviet bloc of suppression of information and restriction of media to a narrow, officially approved interpretation of those events the media are directed to report. The regimes, of course, do not admit to this practice: they cannot justify it to world opinion or to their own citizens.

The efforts of these regimes to control the supply of information reaching their citizens has a dual purpose. An obvious one is to spare the leadership criticism of their policies and conduct and has the self-serving aim of prolonging their political lives. Neither we, nor indeed most of the world, recognize immunity from criticism for public officials or their policies, and I suggest that the burden of proof falls on those who would claim immunity. In my view, and I am sure you would agree with me on this point, such criticism is essential to the interplay between the public and officialdom in any system in which change is to occur through orderly reform rather than through alternating periods of repression and violent upheaval.

A second objective of these regimes in controlling the supply of information is to gain public support—or at least tolerance—for allocation of resources to further policies which require considerable public sacrifice, but which are questionable as to the benefit to the general welfare. I have in mind the enormous and disproportionate expenditures of funds and manpower for heavy industry and for advanced militarily-oriented programs. I am sure I hardly need point out to this Committee that the level of Soviet expenditures in these fields affects our own since our efforts, to an appreciable extent, are in reaction to challenges presented by the Soviets.

From my knowledge of them, I have little doubt that the peoples in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe want official policies which are more responsive to their welfare than those followed at present. I am convinced that, the system of government notwithstanding, the ability of the people to influence their regimes toward greater responsiveness is enhanced significantly by their access to full and accurate information. I speak here of information which we could all agree, and the Soviet and Eastern European officials would be embarrassed to deny, belongs in the public realm. RL and RFE, in supplying such information, often not otherwise available, help to inform these people of the events which affect their lives and also remind them of the extent to which information has been withheld by their own media. From our point of view, these two objectives are complementary, and both add to the effectiveness with which these people can pursue their own interests. To the extent that regime policies become responsive to these interests, change will be more orderly. It was in fact with this thought in mind that I commented earlier that the operations of the Radios contribute to evolution and stability.

This being said as regards the importance of the Radios, let me add a few words on their effectiveness. There is no reason for me to discuss in detail the program content of these services. I do wish to give you my view that the quality of the programs, both news and analyses, has steadily improved over the years. In their level of professionalism, they compare favorably with commercial media in the United States and Western Europe.

174

I have little doubt about the ability of the Radios to penetrate to a significant extent the network of jammers directed against them, although the technological struggle between jammers and broadcasters is never-ending. To me, the most telling testimony to the Radios effectiveness is provided by the thousands of references to them by the media, and even in some cases by the party leaderships, in the target area. If the Radios were not reaching a significant audience, they would be accorded the silent treatment these regimes prefer to give to those social phenomena which are inconvenient for, or contradictory to, the official line.

In concluding, I should perhaps say a word about the importance of maintaining a private, or at least a nongovernmental, character for the Radios. Government-sponsored radios such as VOA necessarily speak for their sponsors. VOA presents among other things our Government's views on events of international importance, including those which occur in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. However, official government radios must show great restraint in broadcasting to a given country news and analyses of events within that country. To do otherwise would complicate official relations and endanger other government-sponsored activities, such as cultural exchanges. RL and RFE can concentrate on internal developments in their respective target countries precisely because of their private character. I realize that this characterization for the Radios may seem to some unnecessary hairsplitting, but my experience has been that hairsplitting is not infrequently an essential element in dealing with the communist nations. In this connection, I think it is pertinent to note that Moscow itself seems to have taken a page out of our book. In recent years their colossal official propaganda apparatus has been supplemented by a global radio broadcasting service, calling itself "Radio Peace and Progress," which claims to be supported by "social organizations" in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Chairman, none of us can be certain how the systems of the USSR and Eastern Europe will evolve; whether they will develop into more cooperative members of the international community, or whether they will remain locked on a dogmatic, authoritarian course. I think we will not know the answer soon. I do not wish to convey the impression that the Radios by themselves will change the history of the Soviet Union or of Eastern Europe. I do believe that the Radios have a real and beneficial influence on internal events there and that to maintain this influence is in the interest both of these peoples and of ourselves.

Sincerely yours,

FOY D. KOHLER.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,  
Cambridge, Mass., May 20, 1971.

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I recently became aware that your Committee has scheduled hearings for May 24, 1971 on a proposal by Senator Case regarding Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. I know that your Committee has a full schedule and do not wish to take the time of your members by seeking the privilege of appearing in person to make a statement on the subject.

I was employed as a political adviser to Radio Free Europe during the 50s and since 1959 have been an interested observer of their programming and research as well as that of Radio Liberty. I therefore feel that I am well qualified to submit a statement for inclusion in the record of your hearings which may be useful to your Committee in examining this subject and hereby enclose a statement for this purpose. If you or members of your Committee would like me to elaborate further on this statement or on my experience within Radio Free Europe, I should be happy to comply.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. GRIFFITH,  
Professor of Political Sciences.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

My professional experience in communications to the Soviet Union was obtained when I was Political Advisor to Radio Free Europe, Munich, from its foundation in 1951 until 1959. Since then I have been teaching and doing research in Soviet foreign policy, Sino-Soviet relations, and East European politics, and

have published several books and many articles in these fields. I have also been teaching a graduate seminar in communist propaganda strategy and tactics.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have now been operating for two decades. They were set up as a result of the 1948 Communist takeover in Prague and the Korean War. They have been intended to deny to the Soviet and East European leaderships a monopoly on the means of mass communication in their countries, and thereby to enable the Soviet and East European peoples to have easy and constant access, via medium and short-wave radio, to the news of the world and of their own countries, and informed analysis and comment on them, written by their own countrymen living abroad. With respect to Eastern Europe, Radio Free Europe in some sense is a partial response to the Soviet failure to live up to the Yalta Agreements promising free elections in that area. As for the Soviet Union, Radio Liberty is a counterpart not to Radio Moscow but to such a "semi-official" Soviet medium as Radio Peace and Progress.

During the past two decades a very large amount of audience analysis material has accumulated with respect to the effectiveness of these two stations. I have been following this material regularly on a professional basis, and have discussed it with its originators and with various academic colleagues. It is my professional judgment that both stations have reached a remarkable degree of both elite and mass effectiveness. RFE is probably more effective than RL, and the most effective to Poland and Czechoslovakia. It is overall in Eastern Europe considerably more effective than either VOA or BBC. RL is the most effective western communications medium into the USSR. The effectiveness of these stations, in my view, originates from five factors: (1) the high level of professional competence of their managements and staffs, (2) the quantity and high level of the research and analysis that they generate on their target areas, (3) the length and transmitter power of their broadcasts (e.g. 18 hours per day by RFE to Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary), (4) the great attention they pay to the internal developments in their target areas, and (5) the rising level of dissidence within these areas.

This last point should by now need little elaboration. The idea from time to time expressed in the West that Eastern Europe, and Soviet domination over it, has become, or will become "stable" has been, one hopes, disposed of by the Czechoslovak developments of 1968 and the Polish demonstrations of 1970. Even independent Yugoslavia is in the midst of ethnic dissention, which will become worse once Tito is gone. Nationalism is against the Soviets in Eastern Europe, where they can in the last analysis only maintain their domination by brute force. As for the Soviet Union, dissidence among intellectuals and the minority nationalities is on the rise. Although it is not likely soon to provide a major threat to the regime, it will certainly increase RL's audience. Moreover, RL now serves a unique role, of receiving, processing, and broadcasting back to the USSR the large amount of dissident literature (*samizdat*) which pours steadily out of the Soviet Union. Without RL broadcasts, this literature would hardly be known in Soviet provincial and rural areas; with them, the Soviet opposition can communicate with its potential mass base.

Why should the U.S. government give financial support to these stations? The simplest reason is that their broadcasts lower the effectiveness of the Soviet and East European regimes and raise the level of information, and therefore of informed thought and action of their populations. Neither station, I am convinced, broadcasts anything intended to, or which indeed does, further violent or revolutionary dissent. Both are guided to further the policies of bridge-building and peaceful engagement to Eastern Europe.

One final point: much of RFE's and RL's effectiveness has arisen from the significant degree of autonomy which they have enjoyed from the kind of hour-to-hour governmental guidance which VOA has. Moreover, they would not be as nearly as effective as they are if they were not located in Munich, close to their target areas. It is difficult to see how broadcasting on internal affairs of their target areas could be done nearly as effectively from farther back. It is therefore in my view of great importance that in any re-structuring of their financing and policy guidance relationships with the U.S. government that this be done in such a way that their operations retain their present degree of tactical autonomy.